

CAI
XC 2
- 1955
B 65

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session—Twenty-second Parliament

1955

Government
Publications

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Dr. PIERRE GAUTHIER

LIBRARY

APR 6 1955

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS AND EVIDENCE

No. 1

THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 1955

THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 1955

FRIDAY, MARCH 25, 1955

WITNESS:

A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian
Broadcasting Corporation.

EDMOND CLOUTIER, C.M.G., O.A., D.S.P.
QUEEN'S PRINTER AND CONTROLLER OF STATIONERY
OTTAWA, 1955.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE

ON

BROADCASTING

Chairman: Dr. Pierre Gauthier

Vice-Chairman: Mr. G. D. Weaver

and
Messrs.

Balcer	Fleming	Knight
Beaudry	Gauthier (<i>Nickel Belt</i>)	McCann
Boisvert	Goode	Monteith
Bryson	Hansell	Reinke
Carter	Henry	Richard (<i>Ottawa East</i>)
Cauchon	Holowach	Richardson
Decore	Kirk (<i>Shelburne-</i>	Robichaud
Diefenbaker	<i>Yarmouth-Clare</i>)	Studer
Dinsdale		

R. J. GRATRUX,
Clerk of the Committee.

CA1
XC2
- 1955
B65


ORDERS OF REFERENCE

THURSDAY, March 10, 1955.

Resolved,—That a Select Committee be appointed on Broadcasting to consider the annual report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and to review the policies and aims of the corporation and its regulations, revenues, expenditures and development, with power to examine and inquire into the matters and things herein referred to and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, and to send for persons, papers and records; that the Committee have power to print such papers and evidence from day to day as may be deemed advisable or necessary; that the Committee have power to meet while the House is sitting; that the Committee shall consist of the following Members: Messrs. Balcer, Beaudry, Boisvert, Bryson, Carter, Cauchon, Decore, Diefenbaker, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Goode, Hansell, Henry, Holowach, Kirk (*Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare*), Knight, McCann, Monteith, Reinke, Richard (*Ottawa East*), Richardson, Robichaud, Studer, Weaver. That Standing Orders 64 and 65 be suspended in relation thereto.

Attest.

LEON J. RAYMOND,
Clerk of the House.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115266041>

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Room 277

THURSDAY, March 17, 1955.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 10.30 o'clock a.m. this day.

Members present: Messrs. Balcer, Boisvert, Cauchon, Decore, Diefenbaker, Fleming, Gauthier (*Portneuf*), Goode, Hansell, Holowach, Knight, Monteith, Reinke, Richardson, Robichaud and Studer.

A quorum having assembled, Mr. Cauchon, addressing himself to the Clerk of the Committee, moved that Dr. Pierre Gauthier be Chairman of the Committee.

Thereupon Mr. Fleming moved that nominations close, and complimented Dr. Gauthier on his success as head of the recent Canadian Delegation to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in South Africa and stated that his election as Chairman augured well for the success of the Committee.

And the question having been put on the motion of Mr. Fleming that nominations close, the motion was resolved in the affirmative.

Thereupon the Clerk of the Committee put the motion of Mr. Cauchon, that Dr. Gauthier be Chairman of the Committee. The motion was carried unanimously.

Dr. Gauthier took the Chair and expressed his appreciation of his election and welcomed members who in previous years had not served on the Broadcasting Committee.

The Clerk of the Committee read the Orders of Reference.

On motion of Mr. Goode,

Resolved,—That the quorum of the Committee be 9 members.

On motion of Mr. Knight,

Resolved,—That the Committee print from day to day 750 copies in English and 300 copies in French of its minutes of proceedings and evidence.

On motion of Mr. Fleming,

Resolved,—That a Sub-committee on Agenda and Procedure, to consist of 6 members and the Chairman, be appointed by the Chairman.

On motion of Mr. Decore,

Resolved,—That Mr. Weaver be Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

At 10.50 o'clock a.m., the Committee adjourned to meet again at the call of the Chair.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, Room 277

THURSDAY, March 24, 1955.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. this day. Dr. Pierre Gauthier, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Balcer, Beaudry, Boisvert, Carter, Cauchon, Decore, Fleming, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Goode, Holowach, Knight, McCann, Reinke, Richardson, Robichaud, Studer and Weaver.

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, Geo. Young, Director of Station Relations, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary of the Board of Governors and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

The Chairman presented the First Report of the Sub-committee on Agenda and Procedure as follows:

"Your Sub-committee met at 2.00 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, March 22, with the following members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Decore, Kirk (*Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare*), Holowach and Gauthier (*Portneuf*), and agreed to recommend as follows:

1. That a communication received by the Chairman from the Canadian Chamber of Commerce be laid before the Committee and that members of the Committee be provided with copies thereof.
2. That a decision on hearing national organizations who wish to make representations to the Committee be deferred until a later meeting of your Sub-committee.
3. That Mr. A. D. Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, be the first witness to appear before the Committee.
4. That the Committee meet on Thursdays at 11.00 o'clock a.m. and 3.30 o'clock p.m. and on Fridays at 11.00 o'clock a.m.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Dr. Pierre Gauthier,
Chairman."

On motion of Mr. Richardson,—

Resolved,—That the First Report of the Sub-committee on Agenda and Procedure be adopted.

The Chairman informed the Committee that the Canadian Chamber of Commerce had forwarded to him a short statement of their approved policy on radio and television.

The said statement of policy was read into the record and copies distributed to members of the Committee.

The 1953-54 Annual Report of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation was tabled and copies were distributed to members of the Committee.

Mr. Dunton was called and made a statement on the progress made in sound broadcasting and television since the 1953-54 Annual Report was issued.

The Committee then commenced a detailed consideration of the Annual Report, Mr. Dunton being examined thereon.

Mr. Bushnell answered questions specifically referred to him.

At 12.40 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to meet again at 3.30 o'clock p.m. this day.

AFTERNOON SITTING

House of Commons, Room Sixteen,
THURSDAY, March 24, 1955.

The Committee resumed at 3.30 o'clock p.m. Dr. Pierre Gauthier, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Balcer, Beaudry, Boisvert, Carter, Cauchon, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Goode, Henry, Holowach, Kirk (*Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare*), Knight, McCann, Reinke, Richardson, Robichaud, Studer and Weaver.

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, George Young, Director of Station Relations, H. G. Walker, Director of Network Coordination, R.C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary of the Board of Governors and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Dunton, in response to a request of Mr. Boisvert, tabled the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation Regulations for Sound Broadcasting Stations, copies of which were distributed to members of the Committee.

Mr. Dunton also answered a question by Mr. Balcer, asked at previous sitting, as to the cost of listener and commercial surveys.

The Committee then continued the examination of Mr. Dunton on the 1953-54 Annual Report.

Mr. Walker answered questions specifically referred to him.

At 5.30 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to meet again at 11.00 o'clock a.m., Friday, March 25, 1955.

House of Commons, Room Sixteen,
FRIDAY, March 25, 1955.

The Special Committee on Broadcasting met at 11.00 o'clock a.m. this day. Dr. Pierre Gauthier, the Chairman, presided.

Members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Carter, Decore, Dinsdale, Fleming, Gauthier (*Nickel Belt*), Goode, Kirk (*Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare*), Knight, Reinke, Richardson, Studer and Weaver.

In attendance: From the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation: Messrs. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman of the Board of Governors, J. A. Ouimet, General Manager, Donald Manson, Special Consultant, E. L. Bushnell, Assistant General Manager, H. Bramah, Treasurer, George Young, Director of Station Relations, H. G. Walker, Director of Network Coordination, D. C. McArthur,

Director of Special Program Projects, R. C. Fraser, Director of Press and Information, R. E. Keddy, Secretary of the Board of Governors and J. A. Halbert, Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Walker corrected an answer given by him at the previous sitting as to the cost of work permits issued to amateur singers by the Singers' Union.

Mr. Dunton made a correction in his evidence of the previous sitting with respect to payments to unions for Canadian programs going out of Canada.

Mr. Dunton also answered a question, asked at previous sitting, with respect to the amounts paid by the Corporation to the Music Performing Societies for music performing rights.

The examination of Mr. Dunton on the 1953-54 Annual Report was continued.

During the course of the proceedings, Mr. Ouimet and Mr. Bushnell answered questions specifically referred to them.

At 12.45 o'clock p.m., the Committee adjourned to meet again at 11.00 o'clock a.m. Thursday, March 31, 1955.

R. J. Gratrix,
Clerk of the Committee.

EVIDENCE

THURSDAY, March 24, 1955.

11.00 A.M.

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, we have a quorum. I am going to read to the committee the first report of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure:

"Your subcommittee met at 2.00 o'clock p.m., Tuesday, March 22, with the following members present: Messrs. Boisvert, Decore, Kirk (*Shelburne-Yarmouth-Clare*), Holowach and Gauthier (*Portneuf*). Messrs. Fleming and Knight were given cognizance of the report of the meeting and agreed to recommend as follows:

1. That a communication received by the chairman from the Canadian Chamber of Commerce be laid before the committee and that members of the committee be provided with copies thereof.

2. That a decision on hearing national organizations who wish to make representations to the committee be deferred until a later meeting of your subcommittee.

3. That Mr. A. D. Dunton, chairman of the board of governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, be the first witness to appear before the committee.

4. That the committee meet on Thursdays at 11.00 o'clock a.m. and 3.30 o'clock p.m. and on Fridays at 11.00 o'clock a.m.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

Dr. Pierre Gauthier,
Chairman.

May I have a motion for adoption of the report?

Moved by Mr. Richardson.

Carried.

Now, I have a letter from Mr. McNally of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce:

Dear Mr. Gauthier:

In connection with the meeting of the broadcasting committee, I am enclosing a copy of the approved policy of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce with respect to radio and television.

I respectfully request you to distribute copies of this policy to the members of the broadcasting committee and I am enclosing for this purpose sufficient copies.

Yours sincerely,

W. J. McNally,
Manager,
Policy Department.

Mr. FLEMING: May I ask if the policy referred to in that letter is the unidentified document we have before us?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. I think you have been provided with a copy which reads as follows:

Radio and television offer two of the most influential channels of communication. The chamber believes in the principle that no person or organization in any field should be both competitor and regulator and urges the establishment of a separate regulatory body having minimum essential regulatory powers over radio and television broadcasting in Canada.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is this the complete brief, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN: That is all I have.

Mr. GOODE: Does the chamber intend to make representations before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. McNally did not mention that in his letter.

Mr. GOODE: I think, as a suggestion, that there are words in this proposition which I would like to understand and perhaps they should be invited to attend here at some future time.

The CHAIRMAN: If it is the wish of the committee I will bring it up before a meeting of the agenda committee and we will make a report on it.

Mr. GOODE: The reason I made that statement is I would like to understand what is meant by "minimum essential regulatory powers". I would like to know what that means. The only way we can find out what their idea is is to have them here and have them explain it.

The CHAIRMAN: I will submit your proposal to the agenda committee and give you their report at a sitting.

Now, we have this morning Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, the chairman of the board of directors of the C.B.C., who is willing to say a few words upon the report and especially on television. He has with him Mr. J. A. Ouimet, general manager; Mr. E. L. Bushnell, assistant general manager, Mr. H. Bramah, treasurer; Mr. R. C. Fraser, director, press and information; Mr. D. Manson, special consultant; Mr. R. E. Keddy, secretary, board of governors.

Mr. DUNTON.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Governors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, your committee I think has the last annual report before it. I thought it might be useful if I tried to outline briefly the developments since then, and the general situation in sound and television broadcasting.

In sound broadcasting there are no major developments on which to report during the last year, since the year covered by the annual report. We have continued to try to improve our programs in sound broadcasting in a number of ways. Incidentally the C.B.C. was very successful in winning quite a number of awards again at Columbus, Ohio; I think more than any other network. However, there have been no major changes or additions to program service.

In the way of facilities one of the developments during the year was the opening of studios in Saskatchewan at Regina. These have been operating since early last fall. At Moncton the French language station has been operating for a full year. During the year we have installed and put into

operation a further 14 low power relay transmitters which I think, as the committee knows, are small unattended transmitters which are only watched usually by telegraph operators in outlying points. These represent a small capital investment on the one hand, but somewhat higher annual charge for wire lines. They just carry the service on the network. We have started work, which is approaching completion, on replacing old transmitters with modern transmitters of higher power at St. John's, Newfoundland; Sydney, Cape Breton; Quebec City and Ottawa. Work is going ahead towards a new transmitter which is badly needed at Corner Brook in Newfoundland.

During the year arrangements have been made to add three more private stations to our sound network. That is a very brief summary of physical developments.

The development of television has, of course, had its effect on sound broadcasting. It is having an effect all through the continent in general, I think, but the part of sound broadcasting which is being hardest hit everywhere on the continent is nighttime network broadcasting. The C.B.C. has lost quite a number of commercial network entertainment programs and shows in the evening. This of course does reduce our commercial revenues and we also lose some attractive and popular shows. At the same time we have the problem of filling those periods to keep a regular network service going. So far there has not been any great effect on daytime sound broadcasting because all indications are that a very big audience for daytime radio is being maintained and likely will continue to exist.

Mr. Chairman, on the television side I think the objectives for the Canadian system, as we understand them, can be summed up in general terms, and very simply as: one, to produce a substantial amount of Canadian programming done by Canadians for Canadians; secondly, to convey those programs, together with programs imported for the national service, to the greatest possible number of Canadians all across the country.

Those twin objectives can be stated very simply, but in this country they represent a very big job. I am not talking about just the C.B.C. but all Canadian television in general, and the general Canadian situation. As we all know television is a costly and complex thing in any country, but in Canada we have a very tough set of conditions which have to be faced by Canadian television. There are tough conditions to be met if television is to reach the objectives which we understand have been set for it.

In the first place there is the size of the country. We have a relatively small population living in an enormous area stretching about 4,000 miles from near St. John's, Newfoundland out to Vancouver Island. I do not know how many hundreds of millions of square miles are involved. We do know each television transmitter can cover a radius of only approximately some 50 to 70 miles. That means we need a great many transmitters relative to the size of our population. For example, one television transmitter in New York City or in London can cover a number of people at least equal to the population of Canada. In Canada with some 30 transmitters either built or being built we will still cover a good deal less than the number which can be covered by one transmitter in those places. The result is we need many more transmitters per million in this country than in most countries. Of course, television transmitters are expensive to build and to operate.

Then there is the problem of getting programs to the stations. That can be done in one or two ways; either by means of television recording of programs, recordings in film form which can be sent to stations, or by means of direct network connections. Both of those means again are expensive. The basic condition of the size of the country and the fairly small population makes for

a very high cost of distribution of television programming in this country if that programming is to go to people right across the country and to link the country together.

Again the size of our population affects the whole economics of programming and program production. As, I think, has been said often everything in television is expensive. Usually parallel things are 5 to 10 times more expensive than the corresponding things in sound broadcasting. In program production this applies very directly. Perhaps I could give some rough examples of that. In the United States a good part, or a part, of their network program down there—not the most exciting nor the best—costs from \$25,000 to \$35,000 a program, some place in that range, for talent and production. Of course in the States a number of the better known programs run higher than that; they may run as high as \$40,000, \$50,000, \$70,000, or \$100,000, and occasionally up to \$200,000 or more. In Canada on much more modest standards we have to figure an average production cost for a studio production using talent about \$5,000 for a half hour, or \$10,000 for an hour. When you start to project those figures I think we can see the problem involved in the cost of television production. For instance, if you figure on an hour program a week, one for the English and one for the French network, you are involved in a cost of \$1 million a year for that weekly program. If you think in terms of an hour of that type of program in both English and French 7 days a week there is a cost involved of \$7 million.

Production costs in this country have to be spread one way or another. However, they are spread over a relatively smaller population. In the United Kingdom or in the United States one way or another the money comes from a much bigger public. Here you have not only a smaller population, but also people of two languages, so that in general terms you have two publics, each only a part of the whole, to support program production. In the United States for example, the cost of their pretty lavish productions can be spread over, and is recovered from, a very large public. In Canada to produce the counterpart of one of those shows would cost just about as much as in the United States, but that cost would have to be recovered one way or another from a much smaller public. To put it the other way, the cost of the pretty lavish productions in the States can be recovered usually in their own domestic market, then the use of those programs can be had in Canada at only a fraction of the original cost of the production. A live production here involves large amounts even though the production may be on a more modest scale than in the States. As can well be seen it is relatively easy to fill programming time in Canada with imported programs. It is on the other hand very expensive and hard economically to fill it with Canadian produced programs. The present result is a very heavy pressure from these economic forces for the use on the air in Canada of imported programs as against the production of programs here. Commercial or business arithmetic constantly works for importation, and not for production here.

In Canada we have people of two languages and that, of course, affects the economics of both program production and distribution of programs. The resources available in different ways for production and distribution have to be, of course, divided for English and French language services. I think we are the only country we know of that has started television from the beginning in two distinct language services.

Then, there is the social fact that Canadians have a great many interests in common with our friends and neighbours south of the border, apart from political interests, and we have a lot of those especially in regard to the personalities. There are a great many things which interest Americans and also interest Canadians, and Canadians have a natural liking to see great

entertainment and other material produced in the United States. As applied to television I think that Canadians, because of their closeness to the United States and the community of interest, have very quickly developed rather expensive tastes in television. The Canadian public on the whole seem to expect a pretty generous service from television.

I have been trying to put before the committee some of the things which a television system developing in Canada has had to face in working towards the objectives laid down for it, and which it will continue to have to face. The system that is trying to reach these objectives, as the committee knows, is one overall system with its public and private components, working as a whole toward these national objectives. As we understand it, the prime function of the C.B.C. element in the system is to ensure a substantial basic amount of Canadian program production and to ensure national distribution of national service consisting of both Canadian productions and suitable imported programs. To do this the C.B.C. has the essential revenues coming in from the television public plus all it can derive from commercial activities. Private stations in existence are also essential parts of the system. In their area they are a means by which the national system reaches the public which they serve. They operate with the national service they receive from the C.B.C. and through their own activities, and the revenues from them in programming other time apart from that filled by national service. So that in general the system as a whole, which operates very much as one system, is supported by funds from those two sources and those two sources only: those provided by parliament direct from the television public and money coming from advertising sources. Of course the extent to which the system can reach the objective set for it will depend upon the flow of those resources.

I would like to try to describe quickly the stage the system has reached as of now. As the committee knows, Mr. Chairman, at the moment there are seven C.B.C. stations operating at key points in the country and eighteen private stations. All of these stations carry national service and all are extending national service. The system in this way is covering slightly over 70 per cent of the population, that is, it is making service available in areas in which a little over 70 per cent of the Canadian population lives.

The stations between Windsor, Ontario, and Quebec City so far receive service by direct network connections. That means that ten stations receive service by direct network connection, the others receiving service by means of television recordings at the present time.

As I think the committee knows it is estimated that about one-third of all the Canadian population have television sets, about one-half of all those in the areas in which there is service available. The number, of course, as is known, has been growing very rapidly, especially during the last year and seems to be continuing to grow although, of course, as the number of sets increase the potential sales in the future are correspondingly reduced. The rate of growth in set ownership has been very rapid. In many cases it seems to have been at least as fast and sometimes faster than it has been in comparable areas in the United States at a comparable time in the development of television. This would seem to indicate that Canadians take a keen and demanding interest in television. Also I believe from the point of view of television broadcasters it does indicate the service provided has been good enough to induce a very large number of Canadians to spend a lot of money in acquiring the means of receiving the service.

In developing the programming of the service we have had to face all the factors I have mentioned—the very high demand of the public as we have sensed it for television service, the high costs I mentioned, the relative ease of importation and, of course, the question of funds available or funds and general support from advertisers which can be envisaged.

Under the circumstances we have pushed Canadian production to the limits of the resources available and the facilities and organization which can be provided with them. At the present time the English language national service as a whole is amounting to fifty hours a week—English language national service. Just a little over one-half of that on the average is composed of programs produced in Canada, that means, around twenty-five hours a week. Sometimes more, sometimes a little less of that basic national service is Canadian produced.

Individual stations will have a higher percentage of imported programs because the programming they do themselves tends to be to quite a large extent material imported on film.

The French service can be said to be around thirty-five to forty hours a week, but naturally a much higher percentage of that is Canadian produced—around 80 per cent or more. I suppose in a way the proportion of Canadian production could seem not very high, and yet it represents a pretty big production effort. For instance, I think it often is not realized that in both Montreal and Toronto there is a bigger production effort in television going on than in any other centre in North America outside of New York and Hollywood. And while we are using this large amount of imported material, according to rough estimates over 7,000 different performers of one kind or another a year are being used at the present rate on television. That represents rather over 35,000 either individual appearances or weekly assignments. We are now spending for direct talent alone at the rate of about \$3 million a year.

With the challenges we have had to meet and the resources that can be envisaged as available we have thought that it was absolutely essential to try to attract a good deal of advertising support for the national system, and I think we have been fairly successful in doing this, particularly during the last year. I think perhaps the most important part of this has been in attracting advertising support for Canadian produced shows—shows which the C.B.C. was producing or would have thought advisable to produce in any case.

I believe it is rather over twenty advertisers in both English and French a week who now support Canadian-produced shows. These advertisers, of course, pay full advertising card rates for the station and network time. In addition to that they make very substantial contributions to the cost of producing the programs with which their names are associated. The C.B.C. produces the programs but gets a very considerable revenue in connection with the production. At the same time the C.B.C. keeps the control and the responsibility for these Canadian productions and for the money from every source that is being used for them and keeps what has been found to be the essential control of the complicated production teams that are needed in television work.

I think the program policy we have tried to follow in general terms is known to the committee. We have tried to develop a service that had a sensible balance in it, that covered a variety of different interests and possibilities. We know that television is a great entertainment medium and that a great number of people want entertainment from television, and we have tried to see that there is plenty of entertainment and fare for amusement in the television service. We have also thought, and we have thought that parliament believed that television is a wonderful means of communicating a great many other things, and we have tried to the measure of our ability and resources available to see that the service does communicate a great many other things.

For example, a great amount of effort has been put into establishing a visual news service so that a great many Canadians can see what is going on in their own country and the rest of the world. We have tried to broadcast national events. A great deal of effort has been put into developing children's programs. Some of the children's programs you see on television are pure entertainment, but a good many are not only entertainment and interesting

but will add something to a child's mind as he watches it and at the end he will have had some stimulation from it. We have tried to see that all aspects of interest have their place in television—religion, the farm interests of the country and a great many others. In general we have tried to see that television programming developed in a way that provided lots of entertainment but also brought a great deal of information to people and brought stimulation, so that we hoped on balance something extra would stay in the minds of people watching it, and not simply leave the minds, after months of watching, with no more in them than was there before. We have tried to see that as well as producing something for relaxation it would bring some information, and things of real beauty or creative ability, and open new ideas in people's minds. Sometimes people do not like the attempts at creative work. We have tried to see that there have been real opportunities for abilities and talent in Canada in a number of different spheres, giving a number of people a chance to be seen by other Canadians and to develop. We hope that the television system as it develops will locate and draw on these various abilities as I think it is to a considerable extent now, and will contribute to the growth of a number of different aspects of life in Canada.

It is one thing, of course, to decide that a program will be a good idea; it is another thing to get it on the air. All the time the C.B.C. has had to face not only the desirability of things, but the means for doing them, of the facilities and organization necessary, which in turn are limited by the resources. They in turn set limits on the time and what can be done in the way of production.

To get to even the present amount of Canadian production we have had to extend the facilities a good deal beyond those seen by the last committee. In both Toronto and Montreal we have had to add fairly large sized studios, one in each, and in addition auxiliary studios in each place. We have had to add a mobile unit in each place. We are trying to develop production at regional points in addition.

As the committee can imagine, the corporation has had to develop a pretty complex organization. The staff working on television alone has grown to about 1,700 people. These people have to do all the many functions related to television production and distribution. It is not like sound broadcasting. Now a television program, as you know, involves not only script and talent and production but also the staging of the complicated technical things, the make-up, the properties, a much more complicated administrative and accounting organization and so on. I think probably many people do not stop to think of what is involved in the distribution alone. For example, the recording service to the non-interconnected stations is using up 16 millimeter raw stock film at the rate of 30 million feet a year now, and that is a big sum even in Hollywood terms. That amount is only to keep this service going to stations in different parts of the country.

The functioning of the network service has developed fairly well. Most of the private affiliates now are taking an average of thirty to forty hours a week on national service. I think the committee understands the basis of that operation. The C.B.C. provides a service to the private affiliates because that is our means of reaching the public in those areas. In addition the private stations get revenue in connection with all the programs in the service which are commercially sponsored. The service seems to have developed quite well.

I think it could be said that the relations between the private and public elements in the system have been good. I think that is probably because we all realize that in the system we are faced together with very big and heavy problems. There have been a great many discussions with the affiliates—one was just held last week—and those discussions are always worked towards means of solving difficulties and reaching the objectives of the system. I

think it has been working well because on the one hand the affiliates have very loyally recognized the function of the C.B.C. to carry out Canadian production and distribution as a national service, and, on the other hand, we have tried to understand their problems—and there are many, too, in establishing and keeping their stations operating on a sound basis, both technically and economically in a business way. I believe the main problems that all of us have in the system are more basically economic.

What I have been trying to describe, Mr. Chairman, as you can see is a system which is by no means stabilized—a system which is very much in the process of growth. The growth has been going on at a rapid rate and will, of course, have to continue to grow for some time just to fill out the structure as it has been outlined already.

For instance, last year two new C.B.C. stations came into operation, one at Halifax just at Christmas time, and one at Winnipeg earlier in the year.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Could I interrupt? When you are speaking of “the year” are you speaking of the calendar year or the fiscal year?—A. I am speaking of the fiscal year, since the last fiscal year.

Q. The fiscal year ended March 31, 1954?—A. Yes, it has been since then. In addition, the production facilities have been developing. Vancouver’s studio went into full operation early last summer, facilities in Winnipeg, Ottawa and Halifax have had to operate so far with very temporary set-ups, but their facilities for more television production are all developing and will be going into operation during this coming year.

During this fiscal year fourteen new private affiliates have been added to the system and, of course, each one means a very substantial extra load in terms of either direct network operation or in the sending out of recorded services with all the complications involved in that.

There are either four or five more private stations under way at the present time that will be going on shortly, one next week, and they all will, of course, require service. As the committee can understand, the rate of operation now is naturally much higher than it was at the beginning of the year and will have to continue to grow simply to fill out the commitments of the system as it is presently and as it is developing.

A good deal remains to be done, as the committee can see, towards making the service really effective. One of the things is the provision of service by network connections to stations right across the country. We hope it will be possible to start that quite soon.

In a more general way and looking further ahead, questions of additional coverage will undoubtedly arise. They will likely be met to some extent at least by further private stations applying for licences, and all involving service from the national system. Possibly also in the future there will be a question of C.B.C. repeater stations required to fill in some of the gaps.

In program production we feel—and I think probably many people would agree—that there is room now for improvement in Canadian production in practically all the spheres of programming. I think we can perfectly well see we can be very proud of a lot of work that has been done so far by Canadians who have come into this new medium, but I think we can also say, looking at the service critically, that there is room for a good deal of improvement. And improvement somehow involves more facilities, more time for work, more organization.

We do feel too that the amount of Canadian production should, in the time ahead, be increased rather than diminished, that is, the amount of service in addition to improvements in the present volume of broadcasting.

And, of course, Mr. Chairman, in all our planning the system as a whole will only be able to accomplish its objectives within the limits of the resources that become available through the two different main channels.

The CHAIRMAN: I thank you very much, Mr. Dunton, for your very interesting remarks both on sound broadcasting and television. They were so interesting that not one question was put to you. The members of the committee let you go on with your remarks and after them I am sure they will be interested in putting questions to you.

Is it the wish of the committee to proceed first on sound broadcasting and afterwards on television or the reverse?

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that perhaps we had better go a little further than that. Obviously we will need to spend a good deal of time with Mr. Dunton and we wish the questions put as coherently and consecutively as possible.

You will remember in the committee two years ago we took for the basis of questioning the last annual report with the list of headings that appeared in it, and the headings were called and questions directed to the particular headings in the report. In that way we covered the ground and there was not a mixture of questions relating to different topics.

I just suggest, if it meets with the approval of the committee, we might follow that same plan now in the interest of orderly procedure.

The CHAIRMAN: I remember that this was done in the 1953 committee.

Mr. FLEMING: That would mean we would take all the items on sound broadcasting first before coming to television and then after that there are two matters of international service and finance. That would be the better way, I imagine, if that is agreeable to Mr. Dunton.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is it agreeable to you, Mr. Dunton?—A. It would be, Mr. Chairman, and we would then have an idea of the order in which things would come up.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us proceed with the headings in the report, using the report for your questions. I wish that every member would speak loudly enough so as to be heard by everyone and especially by the members of the press, who are a little distant from the centre of the hall. You know that the acoustics of this room are not very good. You will have to make a little effort, so as to be understood by everyone in the hall.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Perhaps we might question on the foreword, Mr. Dunton. I notice you have some remarks regarding the Canadian network and, of course, my interest in this matter although it must be national is particularly in regard to British Columbia. I noticed a press report the other day that you were considering putting in a network to include British Columbia. Is that correct or can you give any particulars about it?—A. I think the Minister of National Revenue announced in the House, Mr. Goode, that we had called for tenders and had tentative agreements ready with the associated telephone companies for English language service across the country and with the railway telegraph companies for the French network service, and I think it was announced that these are awaiting consideration for approval by order in council.

What advantage would there be to British Columbia at the moment if that network were put into operation?—A. It means they would get service simultaneously with eastern Canada instead of a number of days later and

that they would get service of considerably better quality. As I think is known kinescope recording is by no means perfect or completely reliable and direct network programming would provide good live service simultaneously.

Q. I am of the opinion that television in British Columbia from your station is on a much higher standard than you get on the Ottawa station. For instance, in regard to one program—

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Goode, I think it was the wish of the committee to start on sound broadcasting first and then television.

Mr. GOODE: I thought we were going through this report and these were some general remarks in the foreword.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, but we can cover all the report if we start on the foreword. It would be better to proceed in an orderly way.

Mr. GOODE: I was just going to tell Mr. Dunton that I am going to have something to say in criticism regarding his eastern television programs compared to what we have in British Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN: When we come to that part of the report you will be allowed to do so.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. Mr. Dunton, you mentioned a drop in revenue from loss of commercial time during the evening. That is not true only of the C.B.C., is it? —A. We gather that some private stations are suffering in the evenings to a considerable extent, but I don't think relatively as much as the networks have been suffering.

Q. That is from competition from television?—A. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLEMING: Could we turn to page 8, Mr. Chairman, where these headings begin?

The CHAIRMAN: Will you go ahead, Mr. Fleming, with music? Any questions on music?

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I take it as we turn these pages, since this report we have before us ends at March 31, 1954, we could ask Mr. Dunton in general that if there are any things that he would like to add to bring the committee up to date in the way of information if he would just offer those without question.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that probably most of the things that are going to raise questions as to the period since March 31, 1954, probably relate to television and finances rather than these items in relation to sound broadcasting, but perhaps if there are any developments they should be relayed to the committee for information if Mr. Dunton will just do so as we turn the pages.

Mr. GOODE: May I be allowed to say a word arising out of this question, even though it is not under the heading of music?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. It should provide harmony.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I have no criticism to offer, but I would like to know the reason the C.B.C. considered it to be necessary to give permission for another radio station on the lower mainland of British Columbia? May I be allowed to ask that question?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: That is a reference to the station for North Vancouver?

By Mr. Goode:

Q. Yes.—A. Well, the application came to us from the Department of Transport. All the details were considered very carefully by the board, and the applicant was heard. The board was convinced that a case had been made out for a station serving that area of north and west Vancouver.

Q. Even though there were other radio stations serving the same purpose? —A. Yes. The other stations were informed by public announcement. They were specifically invited to attend the meeting, and in this case to make representations. If my memory is correct, I believe that none of the other stations raised any opposition to this application.

In the past when there have been suggestions for an increase of power or for new stations in Vancouver, usually the existing stations have protested and argued very vigorously. But in this case, if my memory is correct, there was no opposition by any of the existing stations.

Q. I am not opposing it, but I wondered what the procedure was with regard to the C.B.C. How far is this thing going to go? On the one hand we are putting in regulations in regard to private television stations, yet we are allowing the lower mainland of British Columbia to become flooded with private radio stations in competition with the C.B.C. What is the policy? How far are we going to allow the air to be filled with small radio stations in any particular area?

Mr. FLEMING: No doubt this is an important question and one which should be followed up. Many of us here have questions in relation to this matter of the regulation of other stations, but I thought that those questions should come when we consider a different part of the report. The early pages of the report relate to the C.B.C.'s own programming operations.

The CHAIRMAN: If we will follow the first suggestion and take up the report article by article, it would be better. Then we would not be obliged to discuss these things a second time.

Mr. GOODE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I received your permission to follow this line of questioning. However if Mr. Fleming wants to follow that line of questioning, he should receive the same permission.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. KNIGHT: But that will upset our procedure, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: I think we should follow the report and if there are any questions we want to ask of Mr. Dunton, he will have the information to give with respect to them. I think we should follow the report article by article; and if you have anything to ask other than about music, you can save it until we come to the proper place.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. There are one or two questions about music I would like to ask Mr. Dunton. Has he found it easier now than he did let us say five or ten years ago, to obtain good musical programs, or good musical talent in Canada? My question is based upon my hope that there has been developed in Canada through the use of good musical programs a greater interest in music and a greater appreciation of it and greater ability in our people who find it so inspiring. That is the general idea of my question.—A. My impression gathered from the information which we receive is that what you say is very much the case. The general level of musical ability in Canada and the amount of talent available has grown greatly during the last few years. Perhaps I might put it in another way. Now, in order to get on a network, a performer has to be—or performers have to be of much higher quality than they had to be a number of years ago. I think the general standard has gone up very considerably.

Q. I would suggest too that the general standard has improved among performers, and I hope there has been corresponding improvement in appreciation among the general population.—A. I think that that is harder to measure. I think the general taste for good music has grown greatly in the last few years.

Q. People will protest occasionally when you turn on good music such as a symphony orchestra, and they will say: "Turn it off. Nobody wants to listen to that stuff."

The CHAIRMAN: Do you mean chamber music?

Mr. BEAUDRY: Might I ask Mr. Dunton if he would produce the survey figures in relation to this question?

The CHAIRMAN: Could you do that?

The WITNESS: This subject has come up from time to time over the years. We have expressed our lack of desire to produce figures from commercial surveys which are given to us for our confidential use. We have never felt it was our place to produce them here. They are a service which is given to us for our information.

The CHAIRMAN: I remember that question being asked of Mr. Dunton.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. Could we have the figures with respect to the main surveys to help us in our discussion of this phase of the question?—A. It would be up to the committee to decide. Personally I would not like to produce them.

Q. I do not think it is of vital importance, but it might help us in this discussion.—A. Perhaps I might summarize the point by saying that in a general way we know of degrees of interest in various types of programming. We naturally do a good deal of thinking about it.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. May I ask if these surveys of which Mr. Dunton speaks are surveys which are made especially for the C.B.C.?—A. No.

Q. Then these are general surveys which are open to other subscribers too?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore I cannot see that there is much to the point about their being confidential, if they are available to other subscribers.—A. I do not think it is because anything is secret. We simply buy them on the basis of our confidential use. I think they are widely known in the radio business. There is nothing in the way of secrecy or security about them; but it does not seem to me that it is our part or place to produce documents which somebody else has made and sold to us to look at.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: Did the C.B.C. receive any awards for their musical programs?

The WITNESS: I cannot remember if the Columbus awards included musical programs or not. No, the awards this year were mostly for non-musical programs of different kinds.

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. In your table with regard to the number of hours of broadcasting, you mentioned the number of hours of broadcasting per week presently done by the broadcasting corporation. Could you give us an idea of the amount of time that is spent upon straight musical broadcasts? Is that contained in this report?—A. I think you will find an indication of that at page 28.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on that subject?

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. In connection with that, could you give us some idea of the procedure that is adopted by the board with respect to application from aspiring artists wanting to perform on the C.B.C.? What procedure do you adopt?—A. I can outline it for you very generally, and then perhaps we can ask Mr. Bushnell, if there are more details required.

In general, if it is an application from someone not known before, an addition is arranged. We have auditions set up including people from outside the C.B.C. who make reports to us on their own.

As usual, the first step is when an outsider reports to us in connection with an audition. That will have great weight with our programming officers in deciding whether or not to use that person.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. You mean that these people are professional musicians, and that they act in a manner similar to scouts in connection with hockey, and arrange for local auditions? You could not give an audition to everybody who might ask for one. You would have to have a recommendation from local people?—A. It works in different ways. For one thing, at different times we have audition teams going across the country. It will be announced that they have provided for auditions. Besides that, a person can write in to us. If he looks to be a likely person, an audition can be arranged at a regional point so that he will not have to travel too far. And in addition to that, if our programming officials run across someone who would seem to possess outstanding talent, an audition will be given to him. But in relation to both questions, at the present time there is a far greater quantity of pretty good talent available than could possibly be used.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Can you say whether you find there is a greater interest today among local stations than there was formerly in encouraging talent? Do you find for example that the C.B.C. is faced with an increasing number of requests for airing talent on your network facilities, and that such talent has been limited to smaller units?—A. I do not know about the last part of your question, but I can say that in the last two or three years quite a few stations in Canada have developed some very interesting initiatives in the way of using talent both dramatic as well as musical. We think it is a very happy development. All stations are not doing it, but quite a number are doing very useful and very interesting work.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. Do you ever receive any complaints in regard to your using too much time in the transmission of music?—A. Yes. Some people think there is too much music, while others think there is not enough. Quite a few people think there is too much of the more classical or more serious type of music on the C.B.C. But we think that people who like good music should have a chance to hear it. We do not think that it takes up too much time. On the other hand, classical music occupies pretty good places in our schedules.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. It is much more popular than many people would think.—A. Yes. We think that the more people have a chance to hear good music, the more their tastes for it will develop. The number of people who listen to classical music in a given night would probably be less than the number who would listen to a comedy program or to "Pop" music.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. In Vancouver we have an accomplishment which is most unique. What steps has the C.B.C. taken to broadcast to all Canada the Theatre under the Stars?—A. I am not familiar with the problem. It might be due to the question of rights and such things. Perhaps Mr. Bushnell would say a word on that.

Mr. E. L. BUSHNELL (*Assistant General Manager Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): We have made attempts to broadcast portions of that particular show, but there are a great many union difficulties involved as well as questions of rights. So far we have not been too successful. There is always a problem when broadcasting from outside a station. The elements very often are disruptive.

Mr. GOODE: It is not the fault of the C.B.C. that it is not being broadcast?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Not particularly. We do show an interest in it.

By Mr. Balcer:

Q. Following Mr. Beaudry's question, does the C.B.C. follow the reports of those surveys to the letter. Do you plan your programs and so on with respect to those surveys to the letter? I remember reading an article in *Colliers*, or the *Saturday Night* which said that all such surveys were pretty foolish, and that they were not reliable.—A. The way we work is as follows: We have a small division whose job it is to consider the information which we do get, and try to analyze it further and evaluate it in order to see how useful it is or how much reliance can be placed upon it. The general feeling about commercial surveys is that they cannot be completely accurate. They do provide some indication or comparisons, but they are only one of the indications we have to go on. We have to consider other things as well.

But apart from that, in trying to carry out broadcasting in Canada we think it would be wrong should we find that one type of program got 20 per cent of the listeners and another type of program got 10 per cent, and therefore we ought to increase and have more of the 20 per cent variety and less of the 10 per cent. If you do that you would have no classical music, no good plays, and no information programs.

In general, such things as "pop" music provide an easy way to get a good rating—such things as new and popular songs which are "slickly" put out. We can get a good number of people listening to that. It is not a problem at all. But we think we should deliberately broadcast the better type of music, as well as plays and informative things, even though we know there will be a smaller proportion of people listening to them. At the same time, we try to keep up interest and we follow various means of getting evidence of what people want.

Q. These services are very useful in the way of assessing, as far as the listening population is concerned. You have confidence in the reliability of these services? I do not mean that all your programming is decided on the number of people listening. If that were the case, I suppose that sports and soap opera would take up most of the time.—A. No, it is still limited by our ability to determine how the survey is made and so on. But even then, as I think you have said, even if we had established thoroughly in our own mind the fact that popular music will get a much bigger audience, we still do not broadcast it all the time, or increase it very much. We have to use judgment. We think that even when a program may be listened to by less people, yet those people may get much more out of listening to that program than somebody would by listening to a lot of "pop" music.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. I notice classical music is listed as occupying 1,601 hours according to your schedule. Is that an increase over previous years?—A. I would have to check that. I would guess it was about the same.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. Do those figures include both the networks?—A. Yes. This is all the network programming; it does not relate to the programming of individual stations.

Q. They would comprise the entire transmission over the three networks?—A. Yes. It is down a bit; but the compilation was made on a slightly different basis this year, with regard to programs which will be repeats. In the previous year it was 2,148, but that figure included some programs which were delayed at Winnipeg for repeating later at Vancouver. So I think this year would work out just about the same, actually.

Q. What would be the explanation of the drop?—A. I think in respect to broadcasting that it does not represent a drop, because in last year's report, there was included the repeating of broadcasts for timing purposes. Therefore it was quite different. I think that most of the drop would be represented by that.

Q. I feel that in the last year or two, the younger people of this country are going in more for better programming and more classical music such as the "youth music", which is organized all across Canada. They have clubs organized in many centres which were not known before. I know that in my home town there are over 300 members of this club of "youth music"; and comparing that to the Canadian Concert Hall, and really classical music, they are extending out west. These clubs are extending a great deal out in western Canada and they are meeting with much encouragement. From the figures of the last report and those of this report I suggest that the C.B.C. give as much encouragement as possible to organizations such as these, in order to stimulate good classical and sound music across the country. I am not a connoisseur of music, but I do enjoy good music, and it makes me feel much better than when I get a fiddler for half an hour at a time.

Mr. BALCER: Could you tell us how much it cost the C.B.C. for the commercial surveys over the year, and during last year? How much has the C.B.C. paid for these surveys?

The WITNESS: I could get that for you and have it very quickly this afternoon.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. On the matter of surveys, does the value of those reports of listener surveys lie in the fact that they are the most reliable element in establishing trends?—A. Yes; they have indication of trends or perhaps comparisons. I might say that the commercial surveys available deal only with the quantities of listeners. They are attempts to estimate the number or proportion of the people who listen or do not listen at a certain time. But we would like to have more information about why people do or not listen, or what they would like to hear or see that they are not now hearing or seeing. We plan to do more of that qualitative kind of analysis. This is purely quantitative.

Q. You are speaking more of the use you make of them. But coming back to the reliability of those reports, whatever may be their imperfections, I do not think anybody would contend that they are mathematically precise; nevertheless they are of considerable accuracy, and I think their great value lies in

establishing trends, whatever their imperfections may be. They have a great value in establishing trends of listener interest.—A. Well, in a general way, yes.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Following up Mr. Gauthier's question, if the rule of thumb were applied, would not classical music occupy about nine per cent of your entire time?

The WITNESS: Yes, it looks about like that, and a lot of that time is very good listening time in the evening.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. I would like to follow that up with another question which I hope will reveal my thinking in regard to my original question. I think this is a leading question, but I take it you would agree with me that one of the functions of a national broadcasting system is the raising of cultural standards. Would you agree to that?—A. Perhaps I would put it in slightly different terms.

Q. I said one of the functions?—A. I think the way we would put it is that one of our functions is to see that there is communicated on the air a wide variety of things, including in good measure things of more cultural value.

Q. You would also agree that the only way of acquiring or getting an acquired taste is by means of tasting?—A. Yes.

Q. In other words, you can only become appreciative of things that you hear, and if you do not hear them, then you cannot become appreciative of them.—A. That is part of our thinking. We think that people should have a chance of hearing or seeing some of the more cultural things, and that if they do the tastes for them will grow. History shows that, and we think it is part of our job.

The CHAIRMAN: It is a process of training.

Mr. KNIGHT: And in consequence, certainly some proportion of the time during the day should be devoted to drama or literature, and to giving people an opportunity to acquire a taste through actual experience, be it hearing experience or visual experience, as the case may be.—A. Yes.

By Mr. Boisvert:

Q. What methods are followed to arrive at these surveys of which we have been talking?—A. I can tell you about one or two. One is based on what is known as the telephone-coincidental survey. In that kind of system they telephone homes chosen at random and during different periods of the day, at fifteen minutes or half hour periods. They thereby get a sample of the proportion of people listening, not listening, or out and so on. There are other methods, one used in Canada under which people are asked to keep a diary of what they do and what they do not listen to. A number of experts think that gives a more accurate example. There are other methods used. In the States a number of experts think perhaps the best development is one in which you attach an electronic device to the set which records the time when a set is off or on and what station it is tuned to. That should be a pretty accurate record. But as you see there is lots of room for variation in all methods.

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. Mr. Dunton, I would like a further explanation of the manner of giving these auditions. I do not think that the committee has had sufficient information on that subject. It is very important because you admitted that one of the purposes of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation is to induce

and encourage talent. Suppose you have a pianist or a violinist or instrumentalist performing before such an auditioning board, is that board composed of critics or officers of the C.B.C.?—A. As I said there is a C.B.C. person and usually several outsiders, or musical experts not connected with the C.B.C., who write their own report of their own views.

Q. Could you give us some idea of what the measuring rod of such an audition is? For example, let us say we have two pianists, one is very well known and the other is not, but they may be of equal talent. The natural preference, I suppose, would be given to the celebrity?—A. There are different things involved. A producer may want a well known musician, but whether a person is known or not makes no difference in judgment of an audition.

Mr. Bushnell has had a great deal of experience in this field.

Mr. E. L. BUSHNELL: The system which has been used for many years is simple. Anyone who applies for an audition, either personally or by letter or telephone, is asked to indicate his qualifications. In other words, it would be impossible for us to handle all the people who would like an audition. There might well be somebody who can sing one or two or three songs and that is the full extent of his repertoire. We are not interested in people with one or two songs unless they are particularly good. In the production centres we have those panels which are selected because of their expert knowledge in the field of literature, drama or music or what have you. These people are then invited to come at a certain date and they are put in a studio, given a certain number, and the adjudicators sit there and try to assess and evaluate the talent of that particular performer on a marking system. The marking system has been used for quite some time and it would not be very difficult for us to produce to the committee, if we struck out the names of the artists, a sample of the manner in which this auditioning is done.

The CHAIRMAN: That would be interesting.

Mr. BUSHNELL: I do not think there would be any difficulty in that. Then, those adjudications are passed on to our program directors and producers and a list of all the artists who have auditioned is kept and when the producer wants a particular type of artist or program he refers to this list and very often picks out someone who is quite unknown who might, let us say in the field of music as a pianist, have a mark of 90 per cent where possibly somebody better known has only a mark of 75 per cent. Invariably the producer will choose the person who has the highest mark. We are always trying to encourage newcomers particularly in the recital field. We keep periods every week for that purpose of bringing to the attention of the listeners people who are coming along. They are first class young Canadian artists and we give them a great deal of encouragement.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Am I right in saying there would be no competition audition-wise between the new talent and celebrities. You would take the qualities of the celebrities generally as being well known.

Mr. BUSHNELL: Not always.

Mr. BEAUDRY: You would still audition them?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I notice on page 28 that 198 hours are devoted to band music. I believe much of this comes early in the morning and is quite stimulating and invigorating. I am interested in band music, but I do not hear too many Canadian bands featured in that program. I asked a question about this a short time

ago and the information given was that Canadian bands are featured. Would that include our three outstanding Canadian bands, the military, the R.C.M.P. and the R.C.A.F. bands?—A. There are very few recordings of Canadian bands and those Canadian recordings which are available are used, but as I say there are very few available.

Q. Is it possible to have live programs broadcast?—A. We have had live band music programs, but it is an expensive operation.

The CHAIRMAN: In the morning?

The WITNESS: That is the point. I doubt if we would spend all the money that would be required to put on a live band concert at 8.30 o'clock in the morning; that would be a very expensive program.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Or any other time?—A. We have had a band series on the air. It is a question of balancing the money available as to what it should be used for.

Q. Is it not possible to use tape recordings?—A. You would have to pay actually much more for a tape recording. As I think you know for the making of a recording of a piece by a band or orchestra you have to pay about three times the amount you would have to pay for a single live broadcast. We as a rule cannot afford the recording fees. That is why most of our music from Canadian orchestras is live. If it appears on commercial records then we can use it on the record.

Q. Does that apply to amateur bands as well? For instance, a band such as the Kitsalino band which tours periodically?—A. We in effect pretty well have to use the regular recognized professional musicians or pay very high standby fees.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Mr. Dunton, do you break down the costs of your performing rights between the various kinds of music?

The WITNESS: No.

Mr. BEAUDRY: What were the performing costs to you in the year covered by this report offhand?

The WITNESS: My memory is that the CAPAC rates are about \$165,000.

Mr. FLEMING: If there is a table on this it might be just as well to put the whole thing on the record now.

The WITNESS: Would the committee want the performing rights to the main societies? Then in addition we have to pay special full rights for some big works. Perhaps we could divide it into those two categories.

Mr. BEAUDRY: You pay to the major performing companies?

The WITNESS: The CAPAC and in addition there are other special rights we have to pay.

The CHAIRMAN: I suppose you will not be able to produce that for this afternoon's meeting?

The WITNESS: I think we could have it for tomorrow morning.

Mr. BEAUDRY: At the same time could we have the figures of CAPAC and ASCAP?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. I have one further question on this. Suppose that an artist has made application to perform on a network and is reviewed by this examining board are there any other qualifications he must have in order to be able to perform? Does he pay any fee?—A. No We pay them.

Q. Yes. But he also must be a member of a union before he is able to perform?—A. The way the various agreements are now, if he were not a member of the union he would probably have to become one very soon if he performed several times.

Mr. GOODE: In your answer to Mr. Dinsdale you said that amateur bands would not be allowed on the networks. In effect that has nothing to do with the C.B.C., but rather is a matter between the unions and the C.B.C.?

The WITNESS: I did not say allowed. I said there would be difficulties.

Mr. GOODE: It is the unions who disallow amateur bands on the air?

The WITNESS: The problem arises in connection with unions. I think we have put some amateur programs on at times but there are things which have to be worked out.

Mr. GOODE: Did it create criticism?

Mr. BUSHNELL: We are not completely prevented from putting amateur bands on the air, but we have an agreement with the musician's union that if and when we put amateur bands on the air we pay a standby fee to the musicians union.

Mr. GOODE: How much is the standby fee?

Mr. BUSHNELL: The equivalent of what it would have cost if we put a professional or union band on in the first place.

Mr. GOODE: How much would it cost to put a professional band on the air in round figures?

Mr. BUSHNELL: That would again depend on the number of people.

Mr. GOODE: Say a 40 piece band?

Mr. BUSHNELL: A 40 piece band for a half hour show with the rehearsal would probably cost \$60 per man or \$600. That is the minimum amount. It could go as high as \$1,000 or \$1,500. On top of that you have to pay the conductor and all told you would probably be spending \$1,000 roughly. Then, we feel it would be unfair to ask the non-professional band to play for nothing and have to make a payment to them of some size.

Mr. FLEMING: What becomes of their amateur standing then?

The WITNESS: That is for them to decide.

Mr. GOODE: I think it should be understood then that if we are going to put on the air an amateur band of 40 pieces there is a sum of approximately \$1,000 which has to be paid to the musician's union. Is that true?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. DINSDALE: Does that apply to programs of local origin as well as to network programs?

Mr. BUSHNELL: It does as far as C.B.C. stations are concerned. I cannot speak for the private stations. I do not know what their agreement is.

Mr. FLEMING: The agreement referred to between the C.B.C. and the musician's union puts the individual stations of the C.B.C. on precisely the same basis as the network programs in regard to paying standby fees?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: That applies not only to orchestras but it would also apply to all other musical programs?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: I suppose it is obvious that that has been a factor in reducing the use by the C.B.C. of programs offered by amateurs?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

The WITNESS: My understanding is it would depend a good deal on whether there was a local of the union in the area or on the relations between any given local and a union.

Mr. GOODE: If we wanted to put the Kitsalino band which has been mentioned here on the C.B.C. station in Vancouver we would have to pay an amount based on the number of people in the band to the musician's union in Vancouver?

Mr. BUSHNELL: That is correct.

Mr. GOODE: Although they have no part in the program at all?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: And there is not a professional musician on the program?

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: I think that a few of our members have to go to another meeting and the committee will now adjourn until 3.30 this afternoon.

Please speak louder, if you can, when you ask questions.

Mr. KNIGHT: I suppose it is not possible to obtain another room?

The CHAIRMAN: This may be the only room available to us for this morning and tomorrow.

Mr. KNIGHT: This is the worst room of all.

Mr. BOISVERT: Could we have the broadcast regulations which are referred to on page 29 of the report?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Hon. Mr. McCANN: I wonder if it might be possible to get something in the line of a public address system put in here. I think you should take it up with the Speaker. The broadcasting people should be able to do that for you.

AFTERNOON SESSION

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, we have a quorum.

A request has been made by Mr. Boisvert to have the C.B.C. regulations for sound broadcasting stations distributed to members of the committee. We have them here. Mr. Dunton was good enough to bring them this afternoon so you will each have a copy.

Mr. Dunton also has a few figures on the cost of listener and Commercial surveys which was asked for by Mr. Balcer this morning. He is ready to communicate them to the committee now.

The WITNESS: Cost of listener surveys, also commercial surveys, for all services in 1952-53, \$31,371; 1953-54, \$38,413.

Mr. FLEMING: I presume that covers listener surveys in both television and broadcasting fields?

The WITNESS: Yes. Some reports cover both.

Mr. FLEMING: I suppose the fact that listener surveys now have to cover television as well as sound broadcasting will have the effect of increasing the cost of the survey service to subscribers?

The WITNESS: Exactly. We are getting more surveys at more points to cover the television.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I wish to continue for a moment on the questions and answers given regarding the amateur-professional fees paid by the C.B.C. I am not anti-union by any manner of means but I was astounded at the situation in which

the C.B.C. is placed. Mr. Dunton, how much money do you consider that the C.B.C. is paying for strictly amateur services to the musician's union? Have you any idea?—A. I have not, but it would not amount to a great deal simply because in view of all the circumstances we do not use amateurs too much.

Q. Do you think it is limiting the use which you would have of good amateurs or good amateur bands in the C.B.C. by the agreement which you have with the musicians' union? Would you use amateurs more if it were not for this contract?—A. I think we would use them more, yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you care, Mr. Dunton, to mention the special circumstances where you can use those amateur bands?

The WITNESS: I think, as Mr. Bushnell explained this morning, in general we can use them if we pay a standby fee to the union.

The CHAIRMAN: You have to pay that to the union every time?

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: In respect to individual performers, does this apply to singers and instrumentalists? Say you have a good amateur saxophone player, if you desire to put that extraordinary performer on the air you also have to pay the union for that individual's services?

Mr. H. G. WALKER, (*Director of Network Coordination, Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*): Would you mind repeating the question please?

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Dunton had replied in respect to amateur bands, and the answer I have is that the amateur bands or orchestras which you use you will pay to them a certain amount perhaps but there is no doubt on this that you have to pay the musicians' union their contracted amounts. Now, in respect to individual performers, as I said to Mr. Dunton, if you have an outstanding amateur saxophone player in Vancouver, does that also apply in that respect?

Mr. WALKER: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: What about singers? Does that apply also?

Mr. WALKER: An amateur singer would have to take a work permit with the union involved.

The WITNESS: It is rather different with performers to a singer, for instance. They have to get what we call a work permit from the union which I understand the union almost always grants up to three occasions in which they can work without joining the union.

Mr. GOODE: What does this permit cost?

Mr. WALKER: \$5.

Mr. GOODE: Even if they only come on the air once and you do not use them again?

Mr. WALKER: They can work free up to three occasions.

Mr. GOODE: Amateur participation in the C.B.C. or in any radio station for that matter is controlled entirely by those unions?

The WITNESS: In the C.B.C. it is very restricted under the agreements we are in. In individual stations it varies a great deal depending on local conditions, or whether there is a musicians' union local in the area.

Mr. GOODE: Is there one rule for the C.B.C. and another rule for the individual stations in this matter?

The WITNESS: We have to operate all across Canada to a large extent from major points where there are unions and therefore as a rule we enter into these arrangements.

Mr. GOODE: This applies to the whole C.B.C. network.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. Mr. Dunton, would it apply in the case where the C.B.C. sponsored an amateur program of complete amateurs.—A. Instrumentalists?

Q. Regardless of what they were. Would it apply in that respect also? Say a half hour program of amateurs?—A. My impression is if it is singers and so on there would not be any difficulty, but I think they still have to get work permits. With musicians it is pretty difficult. I think we have to have some arrangement with the union.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I think there is some sort of an agreement whereby an amateur can perform three times under the title of a strictly amateur program.

The WITNESS: That is right, but not with the musicians.

Mr. GOODE: But at a cost of \$15.

The WITNESS: No.

Mr. GOODE: That was the answer I received.

Mr. WALKER: I said I am not sure, but I think it is \$5 per permit.

Mr. GOODE: So it would be \$15.

Mr. BEAUDRY: In the case of musicians.

Mr. WALKER: No. This is singers.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Is not a singer a musician?

The WITNESS: Sometimes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on this item?

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. You mentioned that you have a breakdown of the amount the corporation pays to the unions as far as amateur performers are concerned? Is that right?—A. No. We could check back.

Q. Would you have the amount that the corporation has paid to the unions during the past fiscal year as standby dues?—A. We could obtain that.

Q. The amounts which the corporation has to pay to the union?—A. We will obtain that information.

Mr. HOLOWACH: I would appreciate that.

Mr. FLEMING: Of course that only tells what you have actually paid in the case of amateurs you have permitted to perform. It does not tell the story of what amateurs might have been permitted to participate over C.B.C. facilities otherwise?

The WITNESS: That is right.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. This regulation I understand applies to the C.B.C., if it is a regulation, in regard to the musicians union. Am I to understand it also applies to private stations?—A. As far as we know similar kinds of things apply in areas where there are musician's union locals. I do not think it applies in areas where there are no musician's union locals.

Q. Are there penalties attached to it for infractions of a union's right in that respect? Supposing the C.B.C. violates the agreement what is the penalty?—A. I think the suggestion which has been made to us pretty forcefully at various times is there would not be a strike but the professional musicians who are members of the American Federation of Musicians in Canada would not have their services available to us.

Q. Certainly that is something which could apply to the farmers who may be denied access to the higher things of life and the same thing could apply to other things. It would be pretty serious, would it not?—A. It is not an easy situation now for broadcasters.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. Do we pay much money to the fees of these musicians over a year?—A. I do not think we pay their entry fee.

Q. Do you pay much money out. Is it a large item?—A. A very large item, yes. For musicians and performers, both on sound and television, it amounts to \$5 or \$6 million a year. A good big slice of it would be musicians.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. Is it not true it would be advantageous for a musician to belong to his union? I know for instance in Hamilton the musicians are paying membership fees annually of only \$6 a year which is a very very economic way to belong to a union. I do not think there is probably a union in Canada to which you may belong as cheaply as \$6 which entitles you to all the privileges. It is not as bad as it probably sounds on the surface. There is an advantage in belonging to the union and they certainly do a lot for the employees. I say it is a very cheap membership, and it is not as bad as it sounds. The people who have the privilege of performing on the radio also have the privilege of belonging to the union. I do not think this is something which is as bad as it seems right on the surface.

Mr. GOODE: I think it should be pointed out to the committee and to Mr. Reinke that I received the answer this morning that with respect to the great Kitsalino boy's band which has travelled throughout the world should the C.B.C. employ their services it would cost something like \$1500 for a half hour program which would be paid to the musician's union. That was the statement made to me this morning.

Mr. REINKE: That may be, Mr. Chairman, but to my knowledge of the musician's union most of the military bands belong to the union.

Mr. DINSDALE: That was the question I was going to ask. Can members of the armed forces bands belong to the union?

Mr. REINKE: Yes, indeed. I am talking about reserve bands. I do not know about active force bands.

Mr. DINSDALE: Apparently in order to hire armed forces bands the members of those bands have to be members of the musician's union.

The WITNESS: I think so.

Mr. BEAUDRY: If we wish to explore that phase Mr. Dunton is not the most competent witness. If we ever want to explore the unions, we should ask the heads of the various unions to appear here.

Mr. HOLOWACH: It might be a very good idea.

Mr. BEAUDRY: Not that I suggest bringing them in, but if we wish to explore that phase we should call them here as witnesses. Mr. Dunton is only in a position, in my humble opinion, to explain the situation which exists between the C.B.C. and the union and not as it relates to private stations.

The CHAIRMAN: I think the committee has all the information it wishes to know about the fees to be paid to the unions. I do not think we should invite the unions to come before us.

Mr. BEAUDRY: I am not suggesting that we should.

Mr. FLEMING: We had the head of the unions before this committee once back about 1947. Mr. Walter Murdoch from Toronto appeared here.

The CHAIRMAN: I remember the occasion.

May we proceed to another phase?

Mr. RICHARDSON: As I understood from what you said this morning you were going to take each of these sections in turn. May I, if Mr. Dunton, remains as the witness, put what might be regarded as a standing question. I can appreciate that the corporation would quite naturally put forward their best foot in the report and I have no question about that. My question would be what in his opinion are the deficiencies in policy, economy and purposes, and how do he and his associates hope to cure them within the foreseeable future.

The CHAIRMAN: With respect to music?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes, he can regard it as a question which refers to music and then the same question will apply to everything else.

The WITNESS: With respect to each item as it comes along it would be a standing question?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: The witness would not be obliged to answer right away.

Mr. RICHARDSON: He may answer it at his own convenience.

The WITNESS: I would like to pass on music because I think on the whole the job was pretty good.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That is all right.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. I have a question as to language and it deals with plays. Down in central Canada we hear the two languages English and French. I was thinking of the other ethnic groups. For instance, the second language in Saskatchewan is certainly not French but Ukrainian so, in connection with the plays I was wondering if the C.B.C. caters at all to other ethnic groups or gives them opportunities to put on plays in their languages because those people like other ethnic groups have contributions to make. I wonder if there is any plan or program for any of that work being done. I am really looking for information and not advocating it particularly.—A. Mr. Chairman, it has always been the policy of the corporation through the years to in general do its programming in two main languages, English and French. Therefore, we have not as a rule, except for a few exceptions, done programs in languages other than in English or French. We have, however, through the years put on quite a few programs, dramatic, musical, and a combination of the two, drawn from particular ethnic groups which always have been extremely interesting. But, we feel especially in national broadcasting we cannot to any extent go into broadcasting in other languages.

Q. Your audience would be limited, of course?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. I was going to call it a point of order but it is not a point of order; but isn't that exactly the reason we have private local broadcasting in Canada to service the local needs of the various regions?—A. I know there are some private stations who have or are doing programs in different languages, some in Montreal and some others in the west.

Mr. KNIGHT: Yes, I was aware of that, but my question was directed to the C.B.C.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other question on plays?

By Mr. Goode:

Q. May I ask Mr. Dunton—I hope this is in order—may we take the case of the Lux Radio Theatre—commercial radio is mentioned in here. The cost of that program shown in Canada, is it shown as the cost of the advertising itself?—A. I think that is a typical example of what I was trying to explain this morning. The advertiser pays a large sum of money for the production of that program in the United States. As far as we are concerned it is not only free to the network, we are paid for carrying it and so are affiliated stations; but of course it has cost us nothing. It has originally cost a lot of money in the United States. We make money carrying it.

Q. You make money carrying it?—A. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Any other question on plays?

The WITNESS: I have a deficiency remark for Mr. Richardson on plays. To commence with, perhaps the biggest problem in dramatic broadcasting is the question of good scripts. Our people are doing a lot of work on that, trying to get better scripts and encouraging Canadian writers to do more and better things, but it is a big problem we have. It is far more of a headache than performers which, I think in Canada, can match anything in the world. The scripts of Canadian writers do not match up to that.

By Mr. Richardson:

Q. May I ask another question apropos of what Mr. Dunton has said? Are you conducting any program in relation to our Canadian universities in relation to play writing?—A. No, but as I say a great deal of effort has been going into these scripts now and that is one suggestion we have been discussing with the university people, of organizing with them some sort of a seminar or stimulation or course on plays for broadcasting. We have done some courses with universities.

Q. Have the C.B.C. established anything like the workshop at Harvard?—A. I suppose some of our broadcasting work could be classed as workshops in that some work has been done, particularly summer theatre, which has more of a workshop approach, trying deliberately to encourage new writers and actors.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Does the corporation work with the Banff Schools of Fine Arts at all?—A. Not that I can specifically remember.

Q. Supplying lecturers?—A. I think some of our people have gone out there on occasion on invitation, but apart from that I cannot think of any direct collaboration.

By Mr. Richardson:

Q. How far have we gone in trying to develop a series of plays written by Canadians relating to our great history?—A. That is the kind of play that our program people have tried to get and I think quite a few successful ones have been done. That is one avenue we are trying to encourage writers along. It has been pointed out to me I might have left the impression that all Canadian writers are bad or deficient in their outlook. That is not so; there are some very fine Canadian writers and some stand out in broadcasting but there are not enough of them supplying material for the present demand.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. From your audience surveys what play is leading the country now?—A. Very likely I think some of the daytime dramatic serials are actually

leading in most of the country. The Lux Theatre has always been very popular. The Stage series on Sunday night on the transcontinental network gets a good big audience.

Q. There is the Plouffe Family.—A. There is the Plouffe Family and there is Un Homme et son Peche. That is a very popular one and probably gets the highest audience rating of anything on the North American continent.

By the Chairman:

Q. Do you not think the Plouffes are catching up on Un Homme et son Peche.—A. It is sound broadcasting. There is a very high popularity rating.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. With respect to script writing do you direct a script writer to the type of play that you require or is it something they come in and present to you?—A. Mostly, in the past years. It depends on the response. Of course, quite a lot depends on our individual program officials and producers. The writers know the type of man to go to if they have a particular kind of idea. As I say, the response is not great enough and our people are considering ways of trying to stimulate it further, but, as you suggest, a particular writer might be open to an idea and discuss it and try to develop ideas.

Q. I was thinking in terms of the reasoning that Mr. Richardson was speaking of and that is along the lines of certain Canadian history or possibly even anti-communist plays. I think while they could be not entirely fictional something along the line like presenting the Igor Gouzenko case and similar points of interest that the people of Canada would like to listen to?—A. We have commissioned series in the past and, as I say, are trying to stimulate writers more in some particular direction, particularly to these historic plays, but on the whole I think most writers will generally do their best work if at least to a very large extent it is their own idea. You cannot go too far in ordering or commissioning people to do plays for you.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. In this program, I think you call it "On Camera" there is a group of authors' names appear after it whom I have never heard of before, but some of them do wonderful work. That is wholly a Canadian program, is it not?—A. Entirely Canadian produced, but some of the scripts are not Canadian.

Mr. WALKER: Some of the scripts are from the United States.

The WITNESS: That is an example of the kind of program where we would very much like more Canadian writers and cannot get them.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. That is television?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. Mr. Dunton, I understand from what you said that you have a pool of script writers, is that correct?—A. No.

Q. Are your script writers or the script that is accepted for presentation, is it submitted individually or is there an organization that sponsors these plays?—A. No, there are writers in the country producing, or potential writers, and in the normal course of events they come to us and say: "Here is a script. Will you buy it? Does it interest you?" That is the normal way things work. We have no writers on staff but, as I say, our program department are thinking of going a little further and thinking of actively holding discussions

with writers, trying to stimulate them into doing more, but there is no staff or sub-department with any group of writers.

Q. In other words, you have no script writers under contract with the corporation?—A. No, our program department might be getting around to that in some special cases, something like Mr. Reinke was thinking of in the line of working out some series and putting writers under contract for specific pieces of work.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Who passes on the scripts after they are submitted, before they are selected and go on the air?—A. Generally, several people. In the last year or two the script department has been organized, dealing mostly with dramatic scripts, but usually a script will go through several different hands. The script department, the drama department, a particular producer, perhaps several producers, perhaps the senior people above them. It will depend a great deal on the circumstances how many people will actually see a script.

Q. Who, for instance, passed on that program purporting to be based on the life of Sir John A. Macdonald in January, which was just a travesty on history?—A. I cannot tell you exactly who would pass on it. It would be the final responsibility, as I said before, of the whole organization.

Q. Well, I think we would be interested to know more definitely if you want to answer that question further. Is there any difference in the method of reviewing or oversight or selection in this regard as between programs for sound and programs for television?—A. Not specifically.

Q. Is it the same people who pass on them?—A. In general not, although especially when it gets into more senior people the more senior people may be dealing with the question of scripts in both. Is that the program or Sir John A. Macdonald in January?

Q. It was in January, I think, about the middle of January.—A. That is the program on which, as is so often the case, we have had a lot of good criticism.

Q. Well, I can be the spokesman for a lot of adverse criticism, because that broadcast was a travesty on history and a travesty on the facts. The case that I have in mind was a television program and if it is handled in a different way there is no point in my pursuing it now, but if it is handled in the same way and by the same people as sound broadcasts I would be interested in knowing who was responsible for the supervision and indeed the selection of that 10 o'clock program last Saturday night over CBLT.

The CHAIRMAN: Television?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Do not go too far on television.

Mr. FLEMING: I just wondered if it was the same people who were doing the supervising.

The WITNESS: Well, it is the C.B.C. as a whole and we are here to take responsibility for everything that goes on the air and I do not think it would be fair to put the finger on individuals because individuals will vary and they have a responsibility above and below, and we are responsible.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Well, we will accept that conclusion that the C.B.C. accepts responsibility for what is done by its officers and employees, but I would like to know in detail what is the machinery and what are the steps. I am interested in particular cases like that by way of example if you can look up by whom the script is received, reviewed, selected, edited and produced. If this is not the time to do it I would ask that you do it sometime because I am interested in following that up in detail.

Mr. BEAUDRY: So that we may better appreciate the extent of that responsibility would Mr. Dunton care to give us at a later date an account of the amount of scripts which are produced over the C.B.C. in the course of a year. I am thinking of each individual program, whether it be quarter-hour, half-hour or hour both separately for radio and television. It might be interesting too if it is possible to give the number of script writers involved in all cases.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Concerning script writers you hear the names of certain individuals mentioned quite frequently on C.B.C. programs in connection with scripts. They operate on a script like Len Peterson, for example, who is associated with the "In Search of Ourselves" program.—A. For a series like that a writer might be commissioned, probably would be, for several scripts in advance or else would be asked to submit probably several scripts.

Q. But apparently the writer of established reputation is asked to submit scripts quite frequently?—A. He is naturally much more likely to be for a regular series like that than someone who is not known, simply because our people can be more sure of getting good work out of him, but I might also add they are desperately seeking for more people in whom they can have confidence from whom they can take scripts and ask to do special assignments.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Is there any connection in your opinion, Mr. Dunton, between the scarcity of scripts you have mentioned and the financial reward? I have not the faintest idea what these people get. I was wondering if the financial reward was any inducement or if the financial inducement is not high?—A. Naturally, more financial inducement would probably bring out more work. The best advice we can get is that the greatest difficulty, particularly in writing a subject for television, is not so much the money but the fact that for some reason the writers are doing other things and are not producing the volume of work that is needed.

Q. Is there any drain-off to the United States in that regard?—A. I don't know if there is much drain-off in actual writers; there is lots of work done by writers in Canada that goes to the states because in general much higher prices are paid.

Q. What would be the remuneration to a writer per script? I don't know if you would estimate it per annum or per script or what, but have you some figures on that?—A. I can give you rough scales by plays. I think our plays in sound run around \$350 to \$600—television rather higher. That is for an hour's original work. Adaptations are a little less, something like \$300 to \$500—that sort of range—but mind you a lot of work has to go into an hour's play.

By Mr. Gauthier:

Q. When you buy a script from a writer has he got permission to export it to the United States after?—A. Usually when we buy a script it is usually for first rights in Canada only, simply for the reason of economy. It would cost us too much for permanent broadcast rights. We buy no right beyond putting it on the air once.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. Isn't there a Script Writers' Guild, Mr. Dunton?—A. I think a number of writers are in the ACTRA organization with performers and form a group.

Q. Among the French writers isn't there a Script Writers' Guild?—A. Yes, I think there is.

Q. They set their minimum fees in all cases?—A. I think they try to but we in the field of writing have found as a matter of principle we should not have firm agreements of any kind with any one group. We think in principle the field of writing should be wide open so there is no question of one particular group of people having easier access than other people.

Q. I do appreciate that, but I mean the minimum prices are in some cases set by a group of people who have organized themselves to some extent?—A. Well, if a man is a member of a group and comes and says, "My script is available at so much minimum," we either take it or don't.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. So they have unions where the amateurs are separate from the professionals?—A. No, that is what I was explaining. In writing we thought it advisable to see there were no barriers in the writing field so that we can take care of new people coming up.

Q. I imagine you must have some type of committee for selecting scripts. You must have a committee that determines people's musical ability or what is acceptable. I imagine it would be that much more difficult in connection with a script writer to determine which would not be acceptable to the public. Everyone has an ear for music to some extent but not that same ear for interpretation of a script.—A. Well, naturally that is a very important part of the work of our whole program department in deciding what scripts are good, what are not, what should go on the air and what should not, and I think we can see from the discussion in this room there are a great many opinions about that by all concerned. That is the responsibility of the program department. They are the people who have to accept the scripts. It is a very important part of setting up the whole program.

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. Another question with respect to script writers. I understand that the corporation acquired a script entitled "The Investigator"?—A. Yes.

Q. Who is the writer of that?—A. A man called Reuben Shipp.

Q. Can you tell us how much he received for that?—A. No, I cannot give you the figure offhand.

Q. Could you obtain that for me?—A. I could, but we have always for years in the committee explained that we would very much prefer not to give individual amounts paid to individuals simply because of our business dealings. We are in a competitive field, not particularly with private stations, where we are acquiring all sorts of services and it might handicap us in acquiring a certain individual's services. I would say he would be simply paid within the usual range for our plays for first, one time Canadian rights.

Mr. FLEMING: I would warn Mr. Dunton he is going to be faced with the same problem several pages over.

The CHAIRMAN: What problem?

Mr. FLEMING: This matter of whether the C.B.C. is going to be permitted to say it does not want to give on the record the amount paid to an individual for his services.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, I know this point of view expressed by Mr. Dunton has been accepted by one of the previous committees and I even remember the name mentioned and the committee accepted that the C.B.C. could not give the amount paid to the individual.

Mr. FLEMING: I am sure, I think, this committee will do better in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN: Of course, I am in the hands of the committee if the committee decides, but I think this course has been followed in the past.

Mr. FLEMING: I just wished to mention that for Mr. Holowach's benefit.

The CHAIRMAN: Any further questions on this item?

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Are daytime serials, better known as soap operas, restricted to Dominion Network outlets only?—A. No, rather the reverse—entirely on the Trans-Canada network.

By Mr. Balcer:

Q. Mr. Dunton, does the C.B.C. plan to broadcast on television soap operas that they are showing at the present time—

The CHAIRMAN: Are you asking a question on television?

Mr. BALCER: Yes, but while we are on soap operas—

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Very slippery.

The CHAIRMAN: If you will ask that question when we are on television.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. Apparently there is quite a demand for these daytime serials. What happens if there is an area not covered by a Trans-Canada station and a request comes in for these programs?—A. We have tried very hard through the years to avoid criss-crossing networks, that is to say, having a program that is carried essentially on one network going to a few stations on another network, because you get into all kinds of complications. We would resist very strongly putting a Trans-Canada program onto the Dominion Network and vice versa.

Q. Which is the bigger of the two?—A. I think in general the Trans-Canada would be a bit broader in extent.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. Pardon my ignorance, but what is the difference between the two, Trans-Canada and Dominion?—A. The Trans-Canada arose from the first original C.B.C. network across the country and the Dominion is composed of one C.B.C. station and a number of private stations as the annual report shows.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Pages 26 and 27.

The WITNESS: The Dominion is an alternative English language service and it is composed of one C.B.C. station in the Toronto area and a number of private stations across the country. The Trans-Canada operates day and night and the Dominion mostly night-time.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. But I understood the soap operas were Dominion?—A. No, they are carried on the Trans-Canada.

Q. Thank the Lord they are not carried on all of them or we would have no choice of stations sometimes.

Mr. FLEMING: It is a very good thing to have a choice.

By Mr. Richardson:

Q. Mr. Chairman, apropos of that, I don't know whether it is a fair question or not. You have the two major networks, the Trans-Canada and the Dominion. At the moment is there any thought of amalgamating them?—A. We have no plans at the moment. We obviously face problems in the future.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. One more question, Mr. Chairman. Are these serials available to isolated stations serving the northern territory? Is there any exception made?—A. Well, service in the northern territory is not too complete anyway. I don't think any of them are giving any service other than that which we supply by recordings to the small stations in the north. Of course, the daytime serials are carried by the private affiliates of the Trans-Canada and they are available to them. Of course, there are a lot of soap operas carried by private stations on a recorded basis, not on a network basis.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. Aren't these mostly commercial programs?—A. Yes.

Q. Therefore the selection would be left in the main to the advertisers?—A. The advertisers are paying for them.

Q. But it would be left to the choice of the advertiser as to what stations he cares to use or not?—A. He has a great deal to say although on a program if they go on the network we try to see that they are carried on all the network and usually most stations very much want them.

Q. It is optional for private stations to take them or not?—A. Yes, although we expect our full affiliates to take commercial programs and they expect us to provide them.

By Mr. Beaudry:

Q. Mr. Dunton, have you ever explained to the committee in earlier years—and perhaps this is irrelevant if it has been explained in earlier years—the function of your commercial department as to private affiliates?—A. I think it has been explained. Would you like me to outline it a little more?

Q. Yes.—A. I think the committee understands that C.B.C. sound broadcasting primarily is based on network operation. We make arrangements for commercial shows going on the network right across Canada, Trans-Canada, Dominion and French. The advertiser, through an agency, of course, pays us for the time that is used on the network. The charge of the network is made up of the time of all the stations on the network and a charge for communication between the stations. The affiliates get a large part of the revenue associated with their being included in the network for their program. The C.B.C. gets the revenue associated with its stations included in the network and some extra, a rather smaller extra amount as a sort of commission. That in general is the situation.

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. One more question with respect to the script writers. When a script is submitted to you, Mr. Dunton, and accepted, does that become the property of the corporation or is the script writer entitled to use it again on some other occasion?—A. No, as I said before, all we buy is the right to broadcast it once in Canada. It is not our property and we have no rights for broadcast outside Canada or even a second time in Canada.

Mr. GOODE: Mr. Chairman, I have to go and make a broadcast over one of the most prominent stations in British Columbia and I will be back later.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. Before we go off the question of soap operas, can we assume that they all go on at the same time during the day in Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton and so on? Are they carried at the same time or at different times?—A. The network ones are all at the same time except they might be delayed in the west

for time reasons. The ones carried by stations on a recorded basis, of course, could be broadcast at any time.

Q. In that case they could be at different times in some circumstances, the same program?—A. Yes, but if it is a network program it would be at the same time. The possible delay is in the west.

Q. Where you find two broadcasting stations in the same town do you have any prohibition against both stations using the same program at different times or at the same time?—A. So far as we are concerned we have tried to avoid any duplication by carrying the same program on two stations in the same area.

Q. In other words, you do regulate them?—A. To the greatest extent we can, yes.

Q. If one station is carrying "John's Other Wife" and the other station is not, don't you take steps to see that they do not use it?—A. Yes, and if it is on a network basis the way our networks are set up they won't get it in any case.

Q. Why wouldn't they be entitled to get it if their listeners wanted to listen to it?—A. The network is an entity and it has member stations and if a program goes in an area it goes to the members of the network and only its members get the program. We do not have two members of the network system in the same town or same area.

The CHAIRMAN: C.B.C. Wednesday Night. It is subdivided into four separate parts. We will take them together, I believe. Any questions on that?

By Mr. Weaver:

Q. Mr. Chairman, in the second paragraph here it says:

An increasing number of letters from the United States is, perhaps, an indication that listeners in that country go out of their way to applaud programming unavailable on their own networks but which Canadians take for granted.

I would like to ask Mr. Dunton if he has ever had any inquiries as to the possibility of exporting such C.B.C. programming?—A. Yes, the C.B.C. has had a number of inquiries and some have been carried out. Some programs have been carried in the United States, some of the Wednesday Night kind of program, but there is the essential difficulty in that Canadian unions again have so far asked for very large extra amounts if the programs go out of Canada, and we, or the other people concerned on the other side of the border have not thought we could meet those terms yet. This is a very unfortunate thing in our view because taking the present state of sound broadcasting a lot of Canadian talent is not having the chance which it could have to be heard outside of Canada on account of these restrictions imposed.

Q. That being the case, it is actually a liability to export them?—A. Yes, if they were exported either we or the receiving or broadcasting station or network down there—between us we would have to pay a very large amount.

Q. Do you see any possibility in the future of it being a source of revenue or those circumstances changing and of your programs being admired enough that they would be a source of revenue even paying those extra amounts?—A. Yes, it is quite possible. I think what we are discussing here—Wednesday Night—is not likely the sort that would attract a commercial sponsor in the states. We have had programs sponsored in the states but naturally the sponsor is looking at costs too. It seems particularly bad when American programs come into Canada and there is no extra amount paid to performers for rights, but when there is a case of a Canadian program going into the states the Canadian artists want a very much larger amount than the American artists want for their programming to cover all of North America.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Mr. Dunton, you said in reply to Mr. Weaver that certain Canadian programs are not of such type that would attract commercial sponsorship. Would you explain that and say why?—A. I think it is obvious in a very general way that advertising sponsors wish to have programs that will attract a large audience at a relatively low cost.

Q. And if you follow that argument to its logical conclusion then it might mean that if we did have programs of that particular type and class we could not hope for them to be sponsored by private commercial interests and that for that reason we need a body such as the C.B.C. responsible to the whole nation of Canada in order that we may be able to enjoy those programs at all, is there any truth in that?—A. I would say obviously from the way commercial arithmetic works there is not much chance of sponsors supporting certainly the Wednesday Night type of program—very little chance indeed.

Q. You are too modest to answer the last part of my question?—A. As I tried to explain this morning, it is not a question of even the type of programming but any reasonable kind of Canadian production has a very hard time because of the pressures for importing material rather than producing it, even the lighter kind let alone the cultural type.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. It is in order that you may produce programs of that kind that parliament does give you the money?—A. I have understood there was a vote of public funds to carry on a national broadcasting service and that we carry on all sorts of service, not just the Wednesday Night type.

Q. True, but I am dealing with the point Mr. Knight raised, this Wednesday Night production which is appreciated by all—A. That is one element that certainly should be included in the service.

Q. That is one reason parliament votes money to the C.B.C.?—A. I think so, yes.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. On this question of Wednesday Night, I think it is one of the best efforts of the C.B.C., the Wednesday Night program. I am wondering if you have any idea of the listener rating for this program?—A. I can sum it up by saying that on the evidence we have it is naturally a good deal lower than for the usual run of light entertainment. On the other hand, it stands up quite remarkably well against a good deal of lighter entertainment, especially now that a number of the bigger and more lavish shows are off nighttime radio. We find Wednesday Night is standing up well with a good deal of other important entertainment shows. While the audience is not tremendous like the Lux Radio Theatre it is apparent that a lot of people are listening to Wednesday Night, to the solid play or classical music.

Q. Is there any breakdown of listeners?—A. Most of them come from rural areas and it is interesting to note that things like the Wednesday Night program that have some content seem not to attract relatively high audiences in the bigger centres. It is relatively small in Toronto—relatively big in a number of smaller Canadian cities and bigger again in villages and the countryside.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Is it the policy of the C.B.C. to continue it with more classical programs?

The WITNESS: Yes, sir.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. Why was it applied to Wednesday night alone? Why was it not spread over some of the other nights such as Monday and Tuesday and Thursday?—

A. It was a program which was devised several years ago. We wanted to try an experiment and we thought we had better confine it to one night, so that it would be concentrated and could be made known to people who were interested in that sort of thing and who would give attention to it. It seems to have had that effect.

Q. Do you think that it appeals more to city listeners than to rural listeners?—A. It seems to appeal more to rural listeners.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. Is it possible yet to measure the effect of television on the listening audience of radio?—A. We have received quite a few indications and we think it is having quite an effect on the night-time radio audiences in areas where television is available; it has but small effect on daytime audiences. That seems to apply even in places where there is much more extensive daytime television available. But here we expect that very large daytime audiences on the radio are left.

The CHAIRMAN: The next item on page 11 is "News".

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. On page 10 you say:

Talks broadcast by C.B.C. Wednesday night during the year included The Lively Arts by H. M. McLuhan of the University of Toronto, a series of programs dealing with games, comic strips, newspapers, advertising, fashions and other aspects of what is known as North America's popular culture.

I would like to know if you consider that comic strips and fashions are the popular culture of this continent?—A. I think that the difficulty arises from the fact that we use the word "culture" in a different way in different contexts. It is used here this afternoon I think to indicate the more serious types of programs which have larger content of creative thought in them. A more accurate way in which to use the word "culture" might be to mean the whole way in which a group of people live.

Mr. KNIGHT: A way of life, so to speak.

The WITNESS: I think that is another way of putting it. But in this passage it is being used as referring to popular culture or the way of life in North America. Professor McLuhan thinks that you can discover a great deal about people by looking at the comics.

By the Chairman:

Q. Have you received many comments on the lectures of Arnold Toynbee, "The World and the West"?—A. Yes, quite a lot.

Q. Were most of them favourable?—A. As I remember them, yes.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I was interested in Mr. Dunton's observation that the small town and the rural parts of the country are the most receptive of the Wednesday programs?—A. I do not want to put it too strongly, but there seems to be more interest shown there. We have received a higher proportion of particularly thoughtful letters about that kind of program from rural areas.

Q. That would justify a theory that rural areas are the real source of culture.

The CHAIRMAN: Why not?

The WITNESS: In Canada we have had a lot of thinking come from rural areas.

The CHAIRMAN: They have the time to think.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. It might be due to the absence of other types of entertainment in those centres?—A. I think so, in part. As I said, what keeps astonishing me, are the low ratings this sort of thing seems to get in the Toronto area.

The CHAIRMAN: The next item is "News", on page 11.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Has there been any change in the method by which news is gathered and processed in the two years which have elapsed since we were last on the subject?—A. No.

Q. You are still using the news services? There were three which you were using previously, the CP, BUP, and Reuters.—A. Yes. There was a change made this year, as I am sure the members have noticed, in the National news at 1 o'clock and in having news round-up and a short talk immediately after the news. It seems to be working well, and people seem to like it. But there has been no change in the method of acquiring and handling the news.

Q. Or the writing?—A. Nor of the writing.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. Do you find that the reports which you receive from the various capitals throughout the world from your reporters there tend to conflict with those which come in by the other services, or are they pretty well the same? Are we overlapping the services there?—A. I do not think so. They may at times refer to the same things; but from the agencies we get, on the whole, coverage of spot things. We expect the people whom we have under contract in those various places, or whom we hire on occasion, to do more interpretation, or give more background material. There may be a little overlapping, but they are doing essentially different jobs.

Q. Are they essentially C.B.C. men who are sent from here, or are they hired over there?—A. We use both. We have found it necessary in places like London, Paris, the United Nations and Washington to have men who are under contract with us. They are not full time employees, but they are under contract and available to us and we have first call on their broadcasting work, to be sure of the service. And in addition we use other people who are commissioned per occasion, very irregularly.

Q. But they are not full time employees of the C.B.C.?—A. No, in neither case.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. I wonder if Mr. Dunton would be good enough to give us a short summary of how the C.B.C. news at 10:00 o'clock is coordinated, and how it is decided what things are and what things are not news? I ask him to do this because there are some new members on the committee who may not have heard about it.—A. The C.B.C. has contact with the big main news agencies operating in Canada, the Canadian Press, and the British United Press for the supply of their daily news, and for their full file as it goes to the daily newspapers in Canada.

This service goes into our newsrooms across the country such as at St. John's, Halifax, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, and Vancouver. That is so far as the full service is concerned.

Then in each of those points we have our news editing staff who, from the mass of material which they receive, prepare bulletins during the day.

The Toronto news room is the biggest. It does the Ontario regional bulletins, and it does the big main national news bulletin at 10 o'clock.

As will be well understood, a great deal of rewriting is required in order to get our short broadcasting bulletins out of the big mass of material coming from the agencies every day.

Q. These men are trained in interpreting what is news and what is not news?—A. Very much so. We think that our people have developed a pretty good standard of handling news throughout the year. They are trained to put things into bulletins purely on a news basis and on an entirely impartial basis. There are very strict rules about it. They have to do a great deal of compressing, in which they try to keep complete objectivity and to give a sense of news value with impartiality.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Does the C.B.C. take full responsibility for the accuracy of everything which is broadcast?—A. We have to.

Q. Material which comes from the news services is frequently rewritten in order to meet the exigencies of broadcasting?—A. Yes sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Carter.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I would like to ask about the popular reaction to "Capital Report"? Is it very favourable?—A. It seems to be, in general, very popular across the country among the Sunday afternoon programs.

Q. There are commentators who appear regularly in the series "Capital Reports". Do they keep pretty well to the same people, or are they hired on a contractual basis for that service? On what basis do you select those people?—A. They are commissioned for a period of time. Our programing department usually tries to have a panel of three or four running over a period of months so that they may get used to the work and also, we hope, so that we may have variety. In the analysis of what has been happening in Ottawa we use newspaper men of different backgrounds and approach to what is going on around them. Therefore in succeeding weeks you will have different men, although over a certain period of time the same men will reappear.

Q. Does someone censor their talks? Does someone decide whether or not they should go on the air?—A. We do not censor any opinions on the C.B.C. We pick people to go on a commentary program or panel discussion program from among those with various opinions on viewpoints; but we do not interfere with the opinions which they may express.

Q. There seems to be a sufficient number of commentators. There does not appear to be any dearth of them. If they were expressing their opinions on a private station, then an individual who might object to those opinions, or not agree with them, might contact the private station in that regard and advise them of his objection. But I feel in connection with commentators on the C.B.C., if an individual should object to what the commentator is saying, then he will contact his member of parliament rather than contact

the radio station. I have found myself in the position where I have had to try to answer this question: "Why do you allow that type of individual on the air?"

Have you had anything along that line? Sometimes we have no answer for them. At least I have no answer for them, because it is an expression of opinion. If I say that it is the man's own opinion, they will say that such an opinion should not be permitted to be aired. Then I, as a member of parliament, should say that it is not our opinion, but theirs. We sometimes are confronted with a situation about which we are not too happy in that respect.—A. So we know! We have to take the responsibility for putting them on the air and allowing them to express their opinions.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Is that the answer: that all opinions should be on the air?

The CHAIRMAN: Good or bad ones?

Mr. KNIGHT: Exactly.

Mr. STUDOR: But those individuals may not hear opinions on the opposite side.

Mr. KNIGHT: I would like to ask the chairman for his definition of what is good and what is bad.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. While the chairman is thinking that one over, may I ask if the news commentator programs come under the heading of news, or under talks, strictly?—A. The true commentator program comes under talks. Things like news roundup are part of the news or actuality department, also things like Capital Reports, and so on, are under Talks and Public Affairs.

Q. Yes, Capital Report obviously does. But I wondered about straight news commentaries. Do you take them in under news rather than under talks?—A. As a rule, although some of the things you refer to as news commentators are under talks.

By Mr. Studor:

Q. If the opinions given by a news commentator are strictly his own, and they are of a certain type of opinion, who decides when, where, and if possible what viewpoint is expressed?—A. That is the job of the C.B.C., on which we have people working, and doing a lot of work all the time, trying to see that there are fair opportunities for different men to express different viewpoints, and that they are given a chance on the air.

Q. I suppose that is applicable when you have a panel discussion or a press conference; but where an individual may speak, let us say for half an hour, on a radio program, and perhaps a week later someone else comes on the air with a different viewpoint, I wondered how you could correlate those things so that they have a good balance, or that a balance could be maintained?—A. I do not think in that sort of program you can keep an absolute and complete balance. We try to do that in successive weeks by having people with a different approach to what is going on; and I think it is true that on the whole, over a run, we do get a fair balance in the different approaches of different people speaking from different viewpoints.

As you say, you do not get a direct clash of opinion such as you do with a panel program. But anyone listening in on succeeding weeks can get a variety of interpretations which should balance out pretty well.

Q. There is bound to be some difficulty in keeping one opinion balanced with another opinion with which it is in contrast?—A. I do not think it can

be done with complete accuracy. But I think our people have done a pretty good job on the whole in seeing that there is general fairness, and a chance given for different viewpoints to be expressed on a monthly basis.

Mr. REINKE: Is Mr. Studer finished with commentators?

Mr. STUDOR: Yes.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. I think you may be confusing Mr. Dunton. You are probably referring to somebody with different political ideas. I think Mr. Studer is referring to the objective of the C.B.C. commentators in putting their opinions on the radio?

By Mr. Studer:

Q. If it is a paid commentator, that is one thing.—A. These commentators are paid to broadcast for five or ten minutes, and they are free to express their own opinions. They are commissioned by our people, who try to commission different people who have at least somewhat different viewpoints. So you are getting a variety of viewpoints on a fair balance, we hope, over a period of time.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You are speaking simply of news commentators, I take it? Is Mr. Dunton's answer confined to that subject strictly?—A. I was thinking of that particularly as I answered the question on the series of single commentators. As you know, our general approach to the whole matter of opinion broadcasting is along the same line.

With commentators we do not expect that they will try to use their broadcast very much as a platform for hammering down one particular crusade. We try to get experienced people and newspaper observers in Ottawa who are responsible men and responsible observers of what goes on. We try to get men who we think will do an honest and fair job in respect to what is happening. But I think it is only natural that some of them may express their own background and opinions in their analysis. That is why we try to vary them.

Q. Is it possible for you to provide us with a list of the commentators you have used in the last couple of years, or are they all simply retained for an individual broadcast or a series of news commentaries?—A. In Canada none are on salary. We have, as I said before, correspondents in London, Paris, Washington, and the United Nations. We use them mostly with the idea of getting a general descriptive kind of work; but they are also asked to do some commentaries with a certain amount of interpretation of the news, or with comments on the news in them. They are "staff" to the extent that we have contracts with them for the first call on their broadcasting services.

Q. You are including in that group, and in your reply, commentaries from the point of view of source, those which originate in the old country, as well as some in Washington, and some in Canada.—A. I think I have already answered that question.

Q. You made a distinction with regard to certain people in those countries. I would like your answer to embrace your news commentators regardless of where they originate.—A. We attempt to get a balance.

Q. Yes. Now can you assist the committee—not now of course—with a list of the commentators whom you have retained during the years—let us say the last two years, 1953 and 1954 separately, indicating the number of programs each has had? I take it there is no difficulty about that. And I shall be asking for similar information about other talks later on. So we might as well consider this question indicated earlier about the payments for those

services. I think we are concerned about the cost and the balance. I want to be perfectly fair about this because I think we all appreciate that it is a very difficult problem to preserve a balance. I have never made any attempt to deny the difficulty involved.

When you come to the regulation of talks and opinions, you immediately are confronted with a difficulty in carrying out the policy of the C.B.C. of preserving a balance. No doubt the different people sitting around these tables today would draw different conclusions; but I think it is fair to base our conclusions on the persons and the number of times that they have been retained for the purpose of making news commentaries.

My question has to do with the amount that is paid. I am going to ask the same thing in regard to other talks because there you are directly in the realm of opinion, perhaps in a more direct sense than you are in regard to news commentaries. There is undoubtedly the element of opinion, and in the matter of opinions in news commentaries we do not look for them as we do in talks or forums.

I wish to state the problem as fairly as I can and indicate what I think the committee should have by way of information in order to arrive at its own conclusions on this matter of balance. I appreciate the point which Mr. Dunton made, in times past, about not wishing to disclose information which might be of assistance to competitors—not just competitors in Canadian broadcasting, which would be the private stations, but competitors in other fields as well, for such services. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that the matter is important enough—and it is difficult enough—that we who will be called upon to make some judgment on behalf of parliament in this committee, should have all this information, or such information as is required to enable us to reach some conclusions. I dare say that the views which are held around these tables are quite different, on the way in which the policy of balance is being carried out. No one would question that the policy should preserve a balance. But we are entering the realm of principles and opinions there as to what is the proper carrying out of the policy to preserve balance. So I just renew my request for all this information in order to enable us to reach our own conclusions and have it before us with respect to this matter of balance. I would like to have—and I hope it is available without too much trouble on the part of the C.B.C.—the names of all those who have taken part.

I am asking first of all in regard to the news commentaries, and I shall be asking it also in regard to talks; and I would like to know the number of times each person has been on the air in each of those two years, as well as the amount which was paid to him. I would like to say that there cannot be any question of balance of viewpoints, or selecting or picking out some particular group of news commentators, or some particular group such as the Capital Report series. I want to make my request completely general. I hope it won't involve too much work. But I think the matter is of sufficient importance that we should have all this information before us.

The CHAIRMAN: You are asking Mr. Dunton or the C.B.C. to produce the amount paid to every commentator?

Mr. FLEMING: Yes, and on the talks as well.

The CHAIRMAN: You are asking what has been refused in another category?

Mr. FLEMING: It has not been refused yet. Mr. Dunton indicated reasons which I have attempted to deal with myself in relation to what is admittedly a very broad problem.

The CHAIRMAN: But, do you remember Mr. Dunton said a moment ago, he had been asked before on previous occasions to give the amounts of money

paid to a writer for a script or a soap opera or something like that and the committee had accepted to his wish that he should not give the amount paid to the writer. You are asking that the amount paid to the commentators be brought together.

Mr. FLEMING: Yes. Not only that, I made it perfectly clear that I do not wish that there be any suggestion of concentrating on any part of the problem or picking out any particular group I want the information on or whose services were obtained in the broad field of talks we are coming to on the next page. Mr. Dunton did not say that the information could not be obtained. He asked that the request for it be not pressed because it might raise some difficulties in dealing with competition in this field and perhaps between different individuals whose services might be required.

The CHAIRMAN: I would like to have the opinion of the committee on that.

The WITNESS: Could I make a comment?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

The WITNESS: First, having to do with the times and amounts, within reason we can certainly produce the names of people who have spoken or on how many occasions. We can go further and say the length of time or indicate what sort of commentary and how long it was. We also can give the range which is a fairly narrow range of what we pay for talks—it is pretty well known—of different lengths and different categories. Further than that I wonder if Mr. Fleming could not to some extent limit his question. I do know he is trying to be fair. For instance, in the last year we had 6,173 talks in public affairs programs. The number of people would run to approximately over 8,000. I would ask that the question be confined.

Mr. FLEMING: Obviously it has to be confined. I suppose a great many people were only on once or twice. Perhaps I could have a talk with Mr. Dunton. You will appreciate that I do not wish to put him to a lot of unnecessary trouble. I will be glad, if you approve, Mr. Chairman, to have a talk with him and see if we can narrow down the request for information. It may be that there are flat rates and there would be no trouble about giving that rate if it is a flat rate. I will be glad to try to confine this to reasonable proportions as to anything we ask Mr. Dunton to obtain out of the files.

Mr. HOLOWACH: With respect to the question I originally asked as to how much Mr. Ruben Shipp received for his script, in view of the remarks of Mr. Fleming I was wondering if I could repeat my request that those figures be available to the committee of the amount Mr. Shipp received for his script.

The WITNESS: I thought Mr. Fleming's question was a request to look at the ranges for their scripts. As I understand it it has not been decided yet that we would provide the actual amount to the dollars payable for talks. We could provide how many times they have appeared and what their range of rates are for those various types of talks.

Mr. HOLOWACH: Am I to understand that those figures are not available?

Mr. RICHARDSON: Could we first of all deal with Mr. Fleming's request.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes. Have you anything to add, Mr. Dunton?

The WITNESS: No.

Mr. WEAVER: Mr. Chairman, it appeared to me that Mr. Dunton has offered to go as far with Mr. Fleming as he had already offered to go with Mr. Holowach and Mr. Fleming feels it might help if we had a talk with

Mr. Dunton and I think we should leave it with Mr. Fleming to have a talk with Mr. Dunton first. I think both questions are on the same ground and I do not see any reason for carrying it on.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what I thought. I thought that the answer to Mr. Holowach's question could not be refused if Mr. Fleming's question is accepted.

Mr. HOLOWACH: I do not think it was refused. It was just Mr. Dunton's opinion that perhaps it might jeopardize the relationship between one script writer and another. I do not understand why we cannot have that information. It is no state secret and I think it is pertinent to our having a thorough examination of all facets of the corporation's activities.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that for the present we leave this. I will be glad to have a talk with Mr. Dunton about this. I think we obviously do not need, even for the purpose of drawing conclusions about balance, to go into the whole range of people who have been on once or twice. I certainly have no thought of asking the corporation to dig out figures running into thousands of items. I will talk to Mr. Dunton and we can take it up in committee again.

The CHAIRMAN: We will let Mr. Holowach's question stand for the moment.

Mr. STUDER: Do you encounter much comment or criticism in regard to these programs; have you had any larger percentage in connection with these commentators than in any other aspects of your programming, or do you have much demand for series of commentator programs?

The WITNESS: There seems to be a lot of interest in the commentator type of programs such as "Capital Report". Especially in the last year or two. I would not say that they had drawn more than other types of programs. That is a very hard question to answer. We do get some comments about them both ways, but not the type of thing which attracts your attention.

Mr. STUDER: I am not referring to broadcasts such as news as much as individual programs which are on the air.

The WITNESS: The volume of comment about the commentators has not been very high.

Mr. FLEMING: I suppose anytime you make a reference to the popularity of a program the time it is on the air has much to do with listener interest. It may be the old story of whether the hen comes before the egg or vice versa. Some are popular because they are on a good hour and on the other hand may be the hour is given to them because they are popular.

The WITNESS: Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: It is hard to be dogmatic about this.

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: "Public Affairs Features".

Mr. RICHARDSON: Perhaps Mr. Dunton feels he has already in his observations answered the standing question. Has he?

The WITNESS: I think we feel we can be pretty proud of our illustrated news service.

Mr. RICHARDSON: I think you have a right to be proud.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. On this "Public Affairs Features" I suppose I can ask a question under this heading although it does cover others to a certain extent. I am thinking of the region of Newfoundland, our newest province. My question is: is there as much in the way of talks and programs, controversial broadcasts or press conferences, if you like, in that province as there is in the rest

of the provinces?—A. I would think so. We would have to check back to see if the figures add up. In the first place the stations there would carry any national programs just as in any part of the country. I think they have as much of their own regional talk material as other regions. I have some figures here showing regional origins of talks. Public affairs programs, for example, in Newfoundland are 189 as against the Maritimes as a whole of 230, Quebec in English 125, Ontario 202 and the Prairies 341—that covers all the prairies.

Q. The fact that they have come into Confederation recently has not affected this. They have jumped the gap.—A. I think it has been our experience that on the whole Newfoundlanders express themselves very well, very ably and very reasonably.

Q. Yes, we found that out when they came into the house.

The CHAIRMAN: Any comment, Mr. Carter?

Mr. CARTER: I would like to thank Mr. Dunton for his kind remarks.

Mr. KNIGHT: You might also thank your hon. friend.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Have they a provincial political series as we have in other parts of the country?—A. They have had. There are not any running in the province at the moment but they have had them down there.

Q. And their idea of broadcasting in Newfoundland was that it was sort of a child of the provincial government, was it not?—A. Whatever it was it is very much a part of the C.B.C. now and we think a pretty effective part.

Q. That is all for the moment on that question.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I would like to ask Mr. Dunton a question about Citizens' Forum.—A. Would you pardon me for a moment, I wish to add to that last remark. I have just been reminded that the political program series is just going to start in Newfoundland.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. They have not one now?—A. No, it is just about to start.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I wonder if Mr. Dunton could tell us a word about the Citizens' Forum, how that is being accepted throughout the country. Is it growing in popularity or not?—A. I think I can sum it up by saying that the indications of listener interest in it are standing up very well. It has never been one of what you might call the most popular programs in the evening, but it is far from being the least listened to in the evening. It is pretty popular across Canada. The survey also shows that the listener interest goes up to some extent from week to week depending on the subject and who is on the panel. As you are aware, a different subject is treated each week.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. In the first paragraph you say:

Whatever the form, public affairs programs have the over-all aim of encouraging free expression of opinion by factual presentation of material in clear and accurate terms.

Someone on a panel might express views that could be almost considered subversive? What procedure would the C.B.C. take in a matter of that type,

for instance, if the commentator was asking questions of some one along the line of Dr. Endicott who might be expressing his political opinions?—

A. I think one of the difficulties is that there are so many different opinions on what is subversive and what is not. I can put it this way: quite often things said on the C.B.C. by someone have been called subversive by somebody else. Whether they are or not I think would depend on one's opinion.

Q. Is there any limit to the expression "the free expression of opinion"?—

A. There is not formally except the laws of sedition and treason...

Mr. FLEMING: And defamation and blasphemy.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. For instance, if a person was in the middle of a sentence or a broadcast would he be cut off from the broadcast if it was felt that he was saying something that was not in the interests of the country?—A. I don't think that would happen. So often what is in the interest of the country is a matter of opinion.

Q. In other words in so far as the free expression of opinion is concerned there are no bounds. If a person was on the panel and wanted to express any opinion at all about Canada or Red China or Russia he could do so?—A. Once he was on the panel I think that would come out. We would have to accept the responsibility of putting him on the panel.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. It might come out but he would not be re-employed again? —A. That is true.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. As Mr. Dunton says he does not think it could happen. I must remind him as was done in previous years that it has happened. I recall the occasion and I hope you will forgive me for putting this on the record again, Mr. Chairman. During the war I found myself presiding at a meeting of the Canadian Club in Toronto at which a very eminent man who is a university president now and who has had a great deal to do with exposing the efforts of communists particularly among Canadians who have immigrated into this country was to speak and I was handed a telegram about one minute before the gentleman in question was to go on the air from the Canadian Club telling him that his talk would not be permitted to be broadcasted because of the contents. Now, the contents consisted of attacks on communists in Canada. To complete the record we will say again that it was not censored by the C.B.C. That was done during the war and it was the government's responsibility as part of their censorship policy. But the thing has happened. It happened in those conditions.

Now, Mr. Dunton asks "What is subversive?" I think you and I could answer that question very properly, at least to say that communism is subversive. Where do we stand on this matter?

The CHAIRMAN: I know it is.

The WITNESS: I don't think I asked what was subversive. I said there were many different opinions about what was subversive.

The CHAIRMAN: Suppose a man goes on the radio and in the midst of his speech he advocates the fall of the Canadian government.

Mr. FLEMING: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, before you get any further...

The CHAIRMAN: You understand what I mean. Either Liberal, Conservative, C.C.F. or Social Credit. Do you stop them?

The WITNESS: I think it would depend on what he were doing. If he was violating a law of Canada certainly he should be stopped right away.

Mr. REINKE: Would he be?

The CHAIRMAN: That would be subversive.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. I think he should be anyway. That is my personal opinion.—A. If it happened he were violating a law I would hope he would be caught very quickly. If he is within the law then it becomes more difficult.

Q. In other words who would be controlling the situation at that time? Have you any instructions to that effect?—A. They have instructions to see that the regulations and laws of Canada are observed and we try to follow those out.

Mr. FLEMING: You can be very sure that a communist who was put on the air actually and given free time at the expense of the taxpayers is not going to be so stupid as to advocate things that are subversive or that involved a breach of the law. He would get his ideas over much more subtly than that.

The CHAIRMAN: It depends on the intelligence of the man who is talking. Some would do it, others would not.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. I think that is something that at least should be considered?—A. Mr. Reinke, I can assure you that we have thought about this a great deal.

By Mr. Richardson:

Q. Do I assume that the C.B.C. has laid down a manual of instructions on this?—A. Not specifically on this point. Our people in charge only try to see that regulations and laws are observed.

Q. There is no guide?—A. No.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. Isn't it the rule of the C.B.C. that if you are speaking you must always submit your script?—A. No, there is no such rule. People keep saying there is but it is not the rule. If the talk is going on the air then the official in charge must satisfy himself that no rules or laws are going to be violated. If he has confidence in the person he won't ask for the script and if he does not he will ask for the script.

By Mr. Beaudry:

D. Do you not have a standing rule to file a script within a certain number of hours?—A. No, we do not. We do not ask Mr. Drew or Mr. St. Laurent to file scripts. If there is some question we ask for it. It is the man on the spot who would get into trouble if something goes on that should not go on.

By the Chairman:

Q. But you keep one copy of the script?—A. Oh yes, we keep one copy.

By Mr. Reinke:

Q. There is no provision for the cutting off of the broadcast of a panel or a citizens' forum where one of the panel gets out of line—there is no provision to stop them if they are speaking against the country or against our way of life?—A. There is no provision apart from what I said, that our people should see that the laws and regulations are complied with. I would think

Mr. Reinke, you are worrying about something that would not be very dangerous. If somebody does say something on a national network that is not going to intimidate the sensible people in Canada. If someone makes "subversive" remarks on the air it is not going to upset our democracy.

Q. Maybe not, but it is something that should not happen on a government-owned station?—A. We would hope it would not, but there have been things on the air that people have taken very violent objection to.

Mr. KNIGHT: There are people who even object to soap operas.

By Mr. Holowach:

Q. You have a national advisory board, representing twelve national organizations, advising the program committee which is responsible for the Citizens' Forum. Could we have the names of those twelve national organizations, Mr. Dunton?—A. Yes, but I have not got them at the moment. We can get that for you.

Q. Whenever it is convenient for you.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I have a question on the Citizens' Forum, Mr. Chairman. I think it is the sort of program where radio can be effective as an educational medium and I notice the C.B.C. works very closely with the Canadian Association for Adult Education. Is there any tie-up with university extension departments across Canada?—A. I don't think there is directly although at all points our people work usually very closely with the extension departments and I think in turn the extension departments are very active in the programs on the adult education side of the forum—educational groups, gathering material, so to that extent there is participation by extension departments.

Q. That would mean that the Association for Adult Education is responsible for tying in the university departments?—A. In a direct way wherever it is possible it is general procedure in all areas and there is a lot of cooperation between our people and the people of the extension universities.

Q. Does C.B.C. work at all directly with the larger Canadian universities? Do you use them as sources of program material?—A. Very much so, yes. Sources of material, speakers, advice, all sorts of things—yes, a great deal.

Q. You select individuals from the staffs of these universities but do you work with the universities as such?—A. Yes, but generally I think universities consist of a number of individuals and the job is to find out the individual or department that can be helpful and, of course, one thing we know very well unfortunately in universities as elsewhere there are a great many people who know all about things but are not very good at expressing themselves on the air.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. We skipped over this political broadcast item here and it relates to the nation's business and I think that has been kept on a very high plane. It has been referred to as political broadcasts. There are some other non-political broadcasts featured by the private stations over which the C.B.C. has no control. I think they are called Parliament Hill Broadcasts and they are of a non-political nature, as I understand it. There is a general scheme in connection therewith?

The CHAIRMAN: We are in the next article, Mr. Studer, on talks.

Mr. STUDER: No, on page 14 at the top.

The CHAIRMAN: Well, that is talks. We are through with the article public affairs.

Mr. STUDER: No, we skipped over that one.

The CHAIRMAN: I understand we are through with the paragraph public affairs features.

Mr. DINSDALE: One more question—

Mr. STUDER: There are two public affairs—one little wee one and one big one.

The CHAIRMAN: It is the big one we were on. Now, Mr. Dinsdale, you have another question.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. The Cross Section program on page 11 which features economic programs, etc., if the C.B.C. is going to feature some aspect or some group in the Canadian society does it confer with that group as to what goes into the program?—A. Oh, yes.

Q. Recently there was an attempt to provide information on the Life Underwriters' Association. Were they consulted before that program went on the air?—A. Some of the firms might not have been. I know our people consulted a very eminent authority in the field of insurance. As you know, the program has been criticized heavily by senior members of some companies although it got a lot of praise from the lower echelons. It was not a perfect program by any means. That is the program where our people should have got a wider field of advice than they did although they went to a very good authority.

Q. The people taking part in these programs are chosen as closely as possible to be truly representative of their particular group?—A. Yes, that particular one was done in a different way. It was done in a dramatic way from a written script so they were not actual representatives, which makes it all the more tricky. They were trying to make an exposition of some of the factors in insurance, but from a written script which actors did.

Q. In speaking of public affairs generally, if there was some part of the country that thought it had a public affair that would be of national interest how would that section of the country go to you and make representations?—A. The only way would be for the people interested to get in touch with the closest C.B.C. regional office and if it is an interesting one they will be only too glad to have it and if it is a candidate for a national program they will get in touch with the national headquarters. That happens quite a lot.

Q. You don't know whether any approaches have been made on behalf of the International Students' Conference that takes place at the International Peace Gardens annually?—A. I have not heard of it. It may have happened. When does it take place?

Q. Each fall at the International Peace Gardens.—A. In Alberta?

Q. In Manitoba.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Studer, if you want to put your question unless you want to wait until tomorrow. If it is a long series of questions we can wait until tomorrow. We will start on talks tomorrow morning at 11 in this same room.

I must thank Mr. Gratrix for having provided us with this very comfortable room 16. He is the man responsible.

Now, tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock in the same room.

EVIDENCE

MARCH 25, 1955

11.00

The CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen, we have a quorum. Before commencing this sitting, I should like to ask every member present to be as steady as possible in the committee this morning because assistance is very thin.

Mr. GOODE: Why are you looking at me?

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): You are always broadcasting.

The CHAIRMAN: I am looking at everybody. Mr. Walker would like to make a correction in yesterday's evidence.

Mr. H. G. WALKER (*Director of Network Coordination, C.B.C.*): A question was asked yesterday about the cost of a work permit for the singer's union. I said that the cost was \$5. It is \$2.

Mr. GOODE: It does not change your answer to my question?

Mr. WALKER: That is right.

Mr. A. Davidson Dunton, Chairman, Board of Directors of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, called:

The WITNESS: I made a statement yesterday about step-ups required by the Canadian Artists' Union for programs that might be distributed in the States, and I suggested that if those requests were met Canadian artists, say, in Toronto would be paid more than the New York actors whose performances are being carried all over the United States and Canada. I find that is not correct under present circumstances and that if the requests of the Artists' Union at the present time were met, the payments going to them for North American performances would still be less to them than the New York actors for North American performance, actually still about 50 per cent of the New York rate.

Mr. FLEMING: Would it be convenient to put on the record at some time what those rates are, so that we will have some concrete evidence before us? You speak about 50 per cent. That might or might not be significant; we do not know unless we know the rates in dollars. Could you give us some conception of what it really means? Is it significant difference in terms of the cost of operating or sending out programs of that kind?

The WITNESS: Yes, the talent cost is a very big amount. Perhaps I could obtain that for the next meeting.

The CHAIRMAN: Is that agreed?

Agreed.

The WITNESS: I have some figures which were asked for yesterday. You asked for the payments for music performing rights last year. They worked out at \$164,258 to CAPAC; \$26,702 to Broadcast Music Incorporated, another performing rights association; and \$55,384 for miscellaneous music rights. Thus for sound broadcasting the total is \$246,344.

Mr. GOODE: I wonder if Mr. Dunton could give us the proper words of CAPAC, so that we will have them on the record?

Mr. E. L. BUSHNELL (*Assistant General Manager, C.B.C.*): Composers, Authors and Publishers Association of Canada.

Mr. FLEMING: Will Mr. Bushnell please step to the head of the class.

Mr. BUSHNELL: B. M. I. is Broadcast Music Incorporated.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Might I ask a question or two about those payments? Those are for sound broadcasting only, Mr. Dunton?—A. Yes. Last year the television amounts were insignificant because actually the rates for performing rights societies had not been set. There was a moratorium, so that nothing was paid that year to CAPAC or B.M.I. There was \$3,285 for miscellaneous music rights for performances.

Q. You are speaking of the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1954?—A. Yes.

Q. Can you give an indication of how that is going to compare with payments in the present fiscal year that will end next week?—A. Yes, it will be very little different. I think the committee is aware that CAPAC payments are based on a formula, and I think the formula will work close to the same amount, perhaps two or three thousand dollars more. B.M.I. will be about the same and I think the miscellaneous will be about the same.

Q. How are these amounts affected by questions of extending programs into the United States or importing programs from the United States?—A. They are not affected.

Q. Not at all?—A. No, I suppose that some of the miscellaneous ones might possibly. That is when we have to buy grand rights for special performances. We might be only buying Canadian rights, and if by chance that particular performance went to the United States we might have to pay more, but in general the performing rights society would not be affected.

Q. When you purchase rights or pay fees for performances, you acquire all rights in respect to that performance regardless of how far it goes, or is it rather the case of your confining your performance to Canada?—A. You mean, on special arrangements from miscellaneous?

Q. Yes.—A. It would be a question of negotiation in each case, and normally we would buy only Canadian rights.

Q. For the miscellaneous ones you operate under an over-all agreement?—A. The main thing is that the rights for CAPAC, which, as the committee knows, comes under the jurisdiction of the Copyright Appeal Board, are subject to appeal to that body.

Q. They are all advertised in the *Canada Gazette*.—A. They are advertised, subject to appeal and hearing. In return for those tariffs, as I said, we have the right to use the full CAPAC repertoire, which includes a great mass of music which is still under copyright.

Q. And to use it outside Canada if you choose?—A. I think so.

Mr. BUSHNELL: Yes, for the reason that CAPAC is associated with ASCAP in the United States. Do not ask me what ASCAP is. B.M.I. is also associated with Music Incorporated in the United States. They have interlocking agreements. When we come into the area of special rights, when we require a right for an author, they are called grand rights, and the rights are applied only for Canadian distribution. If we use the rights of an author in the United States, we would have to pay the copyright holder for use in the United States.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. There is a question about this matter in relation to representations that were made on behalf of the corporation before the Royal Commission on copyright. I do not wish to go into something that is in effect under review

at the present time by the Royal Commission, but a question has been raised as to why the corporation made the representations which it did some weeks ago through counsel. Were those representations approved by the corporation?—A. In general, yes. In what respect were you thinking?

Q. I was thinking about the representations that were made by counsel on behalf of the corporation to the Royal Commission. There were representations in regard to the amount involved, the rates involved. I have not the transcript of the proceedings before the Royal Commission.—A. I do not think that we mentioned amounts.

Mr. FLEMING: Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to take time out now, perhaps I could look up the record and make my question precise.

The CHAIRMAN: Yes, at the next sitting. I would like that too. Now we will proceed with "Talks" on page 13. That is the problem under discussion.

Mr. FLEMING: May I just make a remark? Last night at the conclusion of the meeting I had a talk with Mr. Dunton, Mr. Chairman, about the extent of the information that I was asking for, and I think it is going to be possible for Mr. Dunton without undue trouble, and without any departure from corporation policy, to give substantially the information that I sought. Perhaps we could leave that matter in abeyance until Mr. Dunton has had time to gather the information. It looks as though we may arrive at an outcome that will be satisfactory to all concerned.

The WITNESS: We will try to produce the information if we can.

Mr. FLEMING: We could leave that for the moment.

Mr. KNIGHT: I wanted to bring up one question with regard to religious broadcasting under the heading of "Talks". What I am concerned with is the propriety of allowing commercial firms to enter the field of religious broadcasting. I would like to say, in case I might be misunderstood, that I personally have no religious prejudices, that I have not heard any program of the sort that I suggest that might be allowed.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Knight, I think that you have anticipated a little the articles under discussion. Religious programs are dealt with on page 20.

Mr. KNIGHT: I did not know that there was a special item. I apologize.

The CHAIRMAN: But I think you are talking of religious talks sponsored by commercial organizations.

Mr. KNIGHT: I do not know that there are any. I was going to ask a question about it. In the meantime I thought that this was a legitimate subject under "Talks". Just as you say. I could take it now and get it over with.

Mr. FLEMING: It would be better if we kept to the general order.

The CHAIRMAN: If the committee wishes to deal with "Talks" first.

Mr. GAUTHIER: (*Nickel Belt*): Let us follow the order.

The CHAIRMAN: Agreed. Let us get on with "Talks" on page 13. Are there any questions? There are some sub-divisions: "Women's Interests", "Literature and Criticism", "The Canadian Scene", "Political Broadcasts", "Public Affairs".

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. What is the basis, and who makes the selection of those who are to participate in the talks, Mr. Dunton?—A. Talks in general?

Q. Take any particular type of talk in the programmes which you have.—A. They come down to the program department, and particularly a good many

of them under the Public Affairs Department of the Program Division. But it is a process in which a great many people and a great many considerations are involved.

Q. How many participate in the selection? I was wondering how you arrive at the selections that are made. Where does the decision rest? Where is the ultimate selecting authority?—A. It is the kind of process which I have had difficulty before in describing to the committee. The organization as a whole is working on it and it does happen that a particular section will come right up to the top, to the general manager, and sometimes to myself for consideration. At other times it is just a question of responsibility as to how far or how wide it goes. But there is no rule or set way of taking people.

Q. I can sympathize with your comment that you find it difficult to describe, Mr. Dunton. I hope that you will not take offence if I say that you have not told us very much as to how it is done.—A. It is difficult to describe because that is how it is done.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. Is there a special committee from the corporation?—A. No, there is no special committee. There are a number of different people who work more in the field of talks, but there is a series of responsible people who may or may not be consulted.

Q. Supposing it is a political broadcast, on these network broadcasts, who selects them? Do you contact the national political parties as to who they want to have on that?—A. That is easy. The parties select them.

Q. I should like to know, because I have never been asked. I want to see whose responsibility it is.—A. That is an easier one. That is the political party.

Q. It is recommended by the national political party.—A. Yes.

Mr. FLEMING: Not only recommended, but actually chosen. The C.B.C. has no responsibility for those chosen at all.

The WITNESS: The time is given to the leader of the party and he may nominate whom he wishes.

Mr. FLEMING: You will have to ask Mr. St. Laurent, Mr. Gauthier.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): I will have whiskers down to here before I get on.

The WITNESS: I am not trying to veil anything, Mr. Fleming. I think that it is a very proper kind of organization. The responsibility runs right up and down on any given occasion and it might go quite widely, or it may be a routine matter dealt with in a routine way.

Mr. FLEMING: Your selections are being made in a variety of fields, some of them political, some of them economic, some of them business, commercial, labour, academic, and a selection is often a matter of very high importance. I was wondering how the selections are made, who makes them, the grounds on which they are made, and the instructions laid down for the guidance of those who are charged with the responsibility for making the selections. Does the Board of Governors not take any interest in supervising this? Is it within the field of the general manager or within the field of the Chairman of the Board or the assistant general manager? Is the assistant general manager in charge of programmes?

The WITNESS: No, there is a program division, and the assistant general manager deals on behalf of the management more with the broadcasting side under the general manager. As an example, take the Citizens' Forum broadcast. Our people working on that would have previously done a good deal of consulting with people or organizations connected with or interested in the subject, depending upon what it is, and the location, so as to get people fairly

near to where the Forum is to be held. From that they would get some idea probably about suitable spokesmen for different points of view. Then, almost invariably, if there is a tricky subject, there would be further consultation in the talks department and program division about those things. It might perfectly easily, and does at times, come up through the head of the division to the assistant general manager and general manager, and at times I may give an opinion on it, too, because as you say, the matter of selection can be very important. It begins with trying to find the best people for the different points of view. Those are the standing instructions to our people in all these matters and it is laid down that we attempt to get good and authoritative spokesmen for different points of view. As everybody knows, this is a tricky field in our broadcasting and naturally one in which the senior officers of the corporation, right up to the board itself may easily get involved and do at times. So that is why I say that the question is a tricky one for the whole organization.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. Are the topics for these broadcasts suggested by the corporation?—

A. Again that is a process which varies with the program and varies with the circumstances. In the Citizens' Forum, for instance, a number of topics are suggested by the forum organization itself. At the end of each year the association officials are asked for comments as to how the forum has gone this year and for ideas for topics for next year. The advisory committee has a great deal to do with topics of C.B.C. talks, and has the final responsibility for the topics. That is a typical example of the topics in which many people are involved. The views of many people are obtained, and finally a matter like that may be considered right at the top of the corporation.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. The Citizens' Forum may be a particular type of example, because there you have the advisory committee, and they consult on the topics as well as on the selection of speakers. The topic to some extent dictates the type of speakers or at least the field in which there are specialists. Take the broadcasts that come more closely into the field of opinion on political subjects arising from day to day, the news commentaries and other kinds of direct political comment from Ottawa, Capital Report, and others. What determines the selection in those cases?—A. In the first place the policy is of trying to get good observers, observers who are good broadcasters, and then trying to get a sensible balance. There again the process would be a continuing one. There would be people dealing more particularly with those programs, but they would be in constant consultation and in receipt of advice from the program people. Again, in cases like that, the evaluation of particular speakers or the series as a whole may come up quite high in the corporation. The responsibility is running up and down all the time.

Q. Where, under those circumstances, is the decision made in regard to the selection? Is it made locally here in Ottawa?—A. It will vary; it really will vary! For instance, some of the things come from Ottawa. I imagine probably the people here would make some suggestion which would be reviewed and considered by a number of people in Toronto. Then again, if things have not been going too well, there may be a suggestion from the senior parts of the corporation in Ottawa. That happens all the time.

Q. When you talk about balance, what kind of balance are you seeking?—A. Trying to get it.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Differences of opinion?

The WITNESS: In commentary programs we are not looking for strong clashes of opinion. We use almost entirely professional observers in Ottawa.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. They are not like the forums.—A. No. We do not think of them as a place where you put on a person expecting him to take a very strong stand or promote a crusade. We usually make use of professional observers to provide interpretation, and we expect them to do the best job of interpreting that they can. We realize that anyone who tries to analyze what has been happening is bound to be influenced by his own views and background. Therefore, we try to use people of different backgrounds and different connections.

In this respect we differ from a number of other broadcasting organizations. The easier way would be to find a man who would be a good commentator and then put him on every day or every week as the case may be. But we think that is a wrong principle to follow, because he will have the tendency of dominating opinions.

Q. It is a wrong policy for a corporation like the C.B.C. to follow which has a network monopoly.—A. I think it is a wrong principle for any broadcasting organization to follow, because any broadcasting organization has a monopoly to a certain extent. Of course there may be differences of opinion about that.

Q. Yes; you can get quite a variety of opinions over a multiplicity of stations.—A. You might.

Q. I think that is about as far as I can go at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Very well. Now, Mr. Carter.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I think I heard Mr. Dunton say that he did not think that balance was an important matter with respect to these commentators. I do not think I agree with him there.—A. I was trying to say just the reverse. We are trying to give a balanced presentation because we think it is very important indeed.

Q. On the program Capital Reports, you have three commentators every Sunday. I am thinking of the commentator who gives the digest of the week's news from London, concerning the British government. I have listened to a good many of those broadcasts, but I hardly hear anybody but Matthew Halton. I hear him Sunday after Sunday after Sunday. I do not see any balance in that. If we are going to have balance we should have people who have other points of view and who can give us a different picture.—A. We would agree with that, Mr. Carter; and I think you will find that Matthew Halton by no means has been on every Sunday. We are preparing a compilation on that matter at the request of Mr. Fleming. According to my records Matthew Halton was on on March the 6th; and the next week it was Kenneth Harris, and he was followed the succeeding week by Robert MacKenzie.

Q. Matthew Halton would have had 50 per cent of the time?—A. No, thirty-three and one-third per cent of the time.

Q. Now, what about your Washington correspondents? It seems to me they have been giving us the Democratic point of view more than the government point of view.—A. May I just say that starting March 6th the men who have broadcast have been James Minifie, Alexander Uhl, James McConaughy, and Max Freedman.

I think James McConaughy would be pretty annoyed if he should hear you say that you thought he was giving the Democratic point of view. There you have a panel of four running, and I suggest that on the whole they are men who would have slightly different views of what was going on in Washington.

Mr. CARTER: I had forgotten McConaughy. But I do not see too great a difference in viewpoint from the others.

By Mr. Studer:

Q. Does the C.B.C. have an official list of these individuals? Do you form an opinion as to their value on what they are saying, or do you wait for developments from the listener point of view?—A. The method followed includes both. Things like this are watched very much inside the corporation, and constant evaluations are being made of the people and of the series as a whole. Of course we also pay attention to comments from the public. That evaluation process is going on all the time.

Q. In connection with the various items here, "Talks", "Quiz", "Farm, Fisheries and Gardening" and "school Broadcasts", is there a committee which is set up within the corporation to determine these programs under the various items, or would there just be a general committee like your group of persons who would determine the broadcasts.—A. I was trying to explain that there is no one group of people or one individual who determines the programs in any of these spheres. There are a number of different people working on them, and on the whole series, and there is a chain of responsibility in dealing with them. In other words, all these things may be criticized or evaluated, and if it is decided to change them, a decision may come at any place in that chain of responsibility in the corporation, or even right from the board of governors.

Q. Would it not make it easier to have a situation rectified if there was one person who was responsible for every one of these different departments?—A. There is a very direct chain of responsibility. If I think something is wrong, I speak about it to the general manager; and if he agrees, there is a direct chain of responsibility to where the thing went wrong. If something has gone wrong, he sees that the responsible people get kicked for its going wrong.

Q. As you say, there is an interlocking or coordination. I thought it was difficult to accomplish what you have mentioned.—A. No, it is not. The chain of responsibility is very clear. You can never know, with respect to any particular broadcast, how far up or down in the chain of responsibility the mistakes have been made. But the chain of responsibility is there, and if there is something wrong, the director of programs gets into trouble, and he in turn takes it out on the people under him who have been supervising something which has slipped.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You say, "when something goes wrong"; in relation to these broadcasts of the talk type, what would that constitute?—A. Mistakes having been made in the view of the C.B.C.

Q. What type of mistake?—A. Imbalance, for instance, if we think that a series has got out of balance.

Q. You mean getting away from a balance of opinion?—A. Yes.

Q. That is, getting too far off to one side?—A. Yes.

Q. A more radical type of thing?—A. More radical or more conservative.

Q. I mean radical in the sense of wide departure from your sense of balance the other way?—A. Yes, for the general run of programs.

The CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Carter.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I am not sure whether I understood Mr. Dunton correctly when I asked him about the English commentator on Capital Reports. He mentioned three names. Did he mean that each of them followed in rotation, and that you would hear any one of them only once every three Sundays?—A. Yes; that is the way it has been running this winter.

Q. I was not sure of that. I thought that one speaker might be on twice as much as the others.—A. There were three of them on succeeding Sundays.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I find myself under some difficulty in questioning Mr. Dunton on this matter. You have a heading "Political Broadcasts", and I think I can justify the questions which I shall ask. Mr. Dunton will remember that on other occasions I asked questions about the broadcasts which were made by Premier Manning in Alberta. I am going to suggest to you that this matter has been prepared for me ahead of time. The chairman may stop me if he does not think I am on the right subject.

In the Edmonton Journal for November 27, 1952, Mr. Solon E. Low has this to say—and you can judge if I am on the right subject. He said:

. . . Premier Manning made a triumphant tour of Eastern Canada—not for political purposes but to do a job in religion. He added: It has its political implications. It will hold implications for us (the party), I am sure.

I think this is the proper place for me to ask a question concerning that broadcasting. I am asking my question on political grounds, not at all on religious grounds.

The CHAIRMAN: I wonder if that was what Mr. Knight had in mind?

Mr. GOODE: No. Mr. Knight's questions were on an entirely different matter. You will remember that in regard to these broadcasts I said that I thought religion had its place in politics as well as politics having its place in religion. I asked Mr. Dunton on former occasions what the C.B.C. was doing in regard to collections on those broadcasts, and whether the C.B.C., through their stations in Alberta, were making any examination of the collections which were made by those broadcasts. I forget what Mr. Dunton's answer was but I would like to have it again.

The WITNESS: We know nothing about any collections of money that maybe related to those broadcasts.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. If I have the right to comment on these broadcasts, according to Mr. Solon Low's conversation with the press at that time—if there were political implications in those broadcasts—he said it, not I—if that is the case, do you not think it is about time we started to exercise some care in the way that donations are paid in regard to supposed strictly religious broadcasts?—A. I can say that we have a regulation regarding the religious type of programs and appeals for funds. The regulations allow appeals for funds by churches or religious bodies on stations which are in the area in which they serve. But the regulations do not allow for appeals for funds over broadcasts outside the area in question which the organization serves.

In the case of this particular broadcast—I have forgotten the name of it—permission to appeal for funds has not been granted because they are made in different parts of the country outside that one particular area that the organization may be serving.

Q. In the case of Premier Manning's broadcasts, they did not have to ask for your permission to make appeals for donations?—A. Yes, they do.

Q. I shall read your regulations at page 2 where it says:

Except with the consent in writing of a representative of the Corporation, any appeal for donations or subscriptions in money or kind on behalf of any person or organization other than

- (i) churches or religious bodies permanently established in Canada and serving the area covered by the station

A. Yes.

Q. This evidently cannot be taken as an appeal for funds in a particular area, because it is not only the local station which carries these broadcasts on Sunday morning; and I am quite sure that you will agree that an appeal for funds is made on that program—not every Sunday but on some Sundays—and that the regulations of the C.B.C. do not permit such appeals for funds.—

A. According to the provisions of these regulations there should not be any appeal for funds, because permission has not been granted under these regulations.

Q. I say that there has been an appeal for funds, but not every Sunday. I have heard them, and I would suppose that other members of this committee have also heard them. What would the C.B.C. do under those circumstances?—A. We would investigate the thing right away.

Q. Well then, may I ask for an investigation by the C.B.C. in regard to Premier Manning's broadcast on a local station. I think it is your dominion network station CKOY, on Sunday morning at 8:00 or 9:00 o'clock. I hear it every Sunday. It is a very good broadcast and I have no criticism of it except with respect to its political implications as stated by Mr. Solon Low in this newspaper clipping.

The CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dunton, were you asked some questions at previous committees about Mr. Manning's broadcasts?

The WITNESS: There were questions asked.

Mr. GOODE: I asked Mr. Dunton the same type of question before, but I could not prove at that time that there were political implications. However, I am not proving this, because Mr. Solon Low has proven it for me.

Mr. DECORE: May I ask over how many stations in Canada Premier Manning's broadcasts are carried? What would the total be?

The CHAIRMAN: By Mr. Manning?

By Mr. Decore:

Q. By Premier Manning of Alberta.—A. I am not sure. I think the last time I looked into it, there were about fourteen stations.

Q. How much time is taken over each station?—A. Half an hour, I think.

Q. Half an hour, every Sunday?—A. I understood so.

Q. That would amount to about seven hours a week altogether.—A. That is not the way we figure it.

Q. Over what stations are those broadcasts being carried?—A. I have not got that information.

Q. Would you be good enough to get that information for us? Are they all in Alberta?—A. I think there are a number of different ones.

The CHAIRMAN: Could you give us the names of the stations?

Br. Mr. Decore:

Q. In what parts of Canada are those broadcasts made?—A. Yes. We can get that information for you.

Mr. DECORE: I have one more question.

The CHAIRMAN: Before you ask your question, Mr. Decore, will you please allow me to say to the committee that there is no Social Credit member attending the committee this morning. Therefore, the committee may be faced with a request from one of those two members to be allowed to make a rebuttal about this question. If so, will the committee allow me to give them permission to do so?

Mr. BOISVERT: Yes, but they should be here today.

Mr. DECORE: This committee would be very much interested in knowing just what is going on. I think we would like to have that information from Mr. Hansell or from somebody else.

The CHAIRMAN: I take it that the committee is agreed. So let us pass the article.

Mr. BOISVERT: Yes.

Mr. GOODE: Did the Social Credit members receive the same notice of this meeting today that we received?

The CHAIRMAN: Yes.

Mr. DECORE: What would be the cost of those broadcasts, approximately? I know you would not have the exact figure, but could you give us an approximate figure?

The WITNESS: I do not think we could. It would depend on what the stations charged them, and we would not know that.

Mr. GOODE: Is it possible to obtain that figure?

The WITNESS: Not very.

Mr. GOODE: Would a request from the C.B.C. to the individual stations be answered in regard to the cost of the program?

The WITNESS: I would rather doubt it. We have no power to ask the stations to give it to us.

The CHAIRMAN: Can you not make a request yourself?

Mr. DECORE: Would it be possible to say that it is between \$600 and \$700 a week?

The WITNESS: I could not say. It would depend on what the stations charged. It might be. It depends on what stations are carrying it, what rates they are charging, and what time it is being carried.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. Are the broadcasts being made on C.B.C. stations only, or only on private stations?—A. Only on private stations.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. Where do they originate?—A. I am not sure. We understand they come by recordings, and I presume the recordings are made in Edmonton.

Q. I thought it was said a moment ago that they originated on the C.B.C. station on the Dominion network in Edmonton?—A. I think Mr. Goode referred to the C.B.C. Dominion network in Ottawa, but it would carry it as a non-network program.

Mr. GOODE: For Mr. Fleming's information, these broadcasts originate from a church in Edmonton.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. I am aware of that. It is a matter of establishing the originating station.—A. There would not have to be a station. It is very likely that it would be recorded by any recording machine. It may be by a machine in the station.

Q. I understand that you are saying, Mr. Dunton, that these particular broadcasts are not going out over any C.B.C. facilities.—A. No.

Q. That is a matter, I suppose, for regulations rather than the type of matter we are discussing now, Mr. Chairman, which is C.B.C. program activities. It is rather a matter in relation to C.B.C.'s general regulating activities.

The CHAIRMAN: I thought that Mr. Richardson had a question.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Perhaps Mr. Dunton could be asked to prepare a brief statement and bring it before the committee.

The WITNESS: About the only other information we can supply is the information that we have about the stations which have been carrying it.

Mr. GOODE: There has been some doubt expressed in this committee this morning that these programs are semi-political. In your regulations, on the first page under (g) you say:

Requiring licensees of private stations to furnish to the corporation such information in regard to their program activities as the corporation considers necessary for the proper administration of this Act.

With that in mind, I think that you would have the right to ask the station the cost of the program.—A. No, I specifically interpreted that before as not asking for any financial questions from the station at the time that regulation went into effect.

The CHAIRMAN: From the private stations?

The WITNESS: Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions?

Mr. CARTER: I think that we should take Mr. Richardson's standing question on these things.

Mr. FLEMING: Or mine, on any comment to bring us up to date.

Mr. STUDER: Are we now still on "Political Broadcasts"?

The CHAIRMAN: There is "Public Affairs", and "the C.B.C. at United Nations". They are all sub-divisions.

Mr. STUDER: On the political broadcast, there is a reference to "The Nation's Business". I was mentioning yesterday prematurely that I found that the "Nation's Business" broadcasts, which are referred to as political broadcasts, were important and quite acceptable. We have a non-political broadcast which, I believe, the private stations are operating and which I do not think the C.B.C. has anything to do with, but they come under the C.B.C.'s regulations. That is the "Parliament Hill" broadcast.

Mr. CARTER: "Report from Parliament Hill".

Mr. STUDER: It is not conducted on the same basis as the "Nation's Business" broadcast, because each individual member is invited to participate in these broadcasts. It is not on a regulatory system such as "The Nation's Business" is, whereby each political party has, I believe, a percentage of the time on the air allotted to it. However, in this non-political broadcast, my understanding is that there is a gentleman's agreement that it shall remain non-political. What I am interested in is this: who shall determine whether these broadcasts are political or non-political? If there is no one to determine that, what is the interpretation of a gentleman? As you know, the general rule for a gentleman is someone who gives no offence to any one, but I should like to have a definition of a political gentleman. If we can determine what that is, I believe we could get it on a better basis for non-political broadcasts, which I think have reached the extreme in these presentations of "Parliament Hill", and we would have a better informed public than we now have. I am somewhat skeptical of this "Parliament Hill" broadcast, if there is no determination of what is political and what is non-political. I do not know whether that would come within the jurisdiction of the C.B.C. It could perhaps come under clause (c) of the regulations: "to control the character of any and all programs broadcast by corporation or private stations".

The CHAIRMAN: When it goes over private stations, the C.B.C. has nothing to do with it.

Mr. FLEMING: That comes up, Mr. Chairman, on page 24, under relations between the C.B.C. and private stations. We are now dealing with C.B.C. program activities.

Mr. STUDER: If it does not come under that, I will be completely out of order.

The CHAIRMAN: You could hold your question until this item comes up.

Mr. STUDER: I thought that item (c) of the regulations would perhaps cover that, but there may be other ones that qualify for that question. If that is the proper procedure, we will leave it until then.

Mr. CARTER: I think that we should have some sort of definition as to what is and what is not a political broadcast.

Mr. FLEMING: It is a question of whether it is in order at this point. We are dealing with the program activities of the C.B.C., not the operation of private stations.

Mr. CARTER: That is entirely separate from the operations of private stations. We have a heading here "Political Broadcasts".

Mr. FLEMING: C.B.C.'s program activities only.

The CHAIRMAN: They have nothing to do with political broadcasts by private stations.

Mr. BOISVERT: I have just one question. What is the allocation of time between the various parties in Canada?

The WITNESS: It varies. Between elections the allocations are worked out on a basis under which the government side gets 40 per cent of the time. The opposition parties divide the other time. The way in which it was worked out by the corporation for the last federal election campaign, it was different from that.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any questions on "The C.B.C. at United Nations"?

Carried.

"Regional Interests", "Radio College", "School Broadcasts".

Mr. FLEMING: With regard to the school broadcasts, we all recognize that the C.B.C. is doing an excellent piece of work in connection with those school broadcasts.

The CHAIRMAN: I agree with you, Mr. Fleming.

"Quiz", "Farm, Fisheries and Gardening", "Variety and Comedy", "Canadian Forces Broadcast Service".

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. This is one point where Mr. Dunton might bring us up to date from March 31st, 1954. Could he tell us something about the cost of operations under this heading within the fiscal year that is closing next week?—A. There is not a great deal which I can add. The service to Korea has, of course, been cut down, and we are likely, from what we read, to be dropping it quite soon.

Q. You mean that you will be dropping it entirely soon?—A. I am saying that from what I read in the newspapers. The service was joined with that of the other commonwealth countries and the Canadian part was reduced; from what I read in the newspapers it may be dropped.

Mr. KNIGHT: It is still operating?

The WITNESS: It is still going.

By Mr. Fleming:

Q. You contemplate that if the remaining Canadian forces should be withdrawn, you will eliminate these broadcasts entirely?—A. Yes. The transmissions overseas to Europe are still going ahead. The transcription service has developed a good deal in the past year. Stations in the Canadian north which were developed by the defence department have been a good deal strengthened during the last year.

Q. I am interested in the matter of the development in the north. I brought up this point a few years ago. I think that what gave rise to this was a trip which a number of members made to Fort Churchill. They were disturbed to find that there was at that time practically no broadcasting of Canadian programs being received but there were daily broadcasts from Russia available all through that area. Since that time, I think that you have taken steps to try to increase the broadcasts available up there. You have left the actual broadcasting in other hands, I believe, out there.

Mr. WEAVER: On a point of order, should that not properly come under either "International Radio Relations" or "Technical Developments". I had a number of questions on that point which I myself wished to put, and I have been waiting until we came to the proper place.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you agree to do that, Mr. Fleming?

The WITNESS: From our point of view, I think it is largely a question of technical development in engineering.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you agree to wait until that item comes up. What page is that on, Mr. Weaver?

Mr. WEAVER: On pages 22 and 23.

The CHAIRMAN: Under "International Radio Relations" and "Technical Development".

Mr. FLEMING: Well, this is not a matter of international relations, it is a matter of providing Canadian programs in that area. I do not greatly care whether we bring it up now or later. I know that Mr. Weaver is interested in it.

Mr. WEAVER: The question of providing the programs really comes under "Technical Development", and that is why I was leaving it until that was reached.

Mr. FLEMING: I do not care, as long as we will cover it.

The CHAIRMAN: We shall leave it until later.

Mr. GOODE: In regard to the services broadcast to Germany, I have had some fine comments on that service. What do you do in regard to army families stationed there at the moment? Is there any service which the C.B.C. gives to the children, for instance?

The WITNESS: Just a part of the general service, which is designed for the families as well as the men.

Mr. GOODE: A man who recently returned from Germany had very complimentary things to say about what the C.B.C. is doing over the stations which are being set up by the forces. I think that the C.B.C. has done highly satisfactory work.

The CHAIRMAN: "Children's Programs".

By Mr. Knight:

Q. The compliments are coming thick and fast. I should like to say that I am glad that the times for children's programs have been increased. Although I do not hear too many of them myself, I am trusting to the good judgment

of the C.B.C. that they are programs suitable for children. I say I am glad that the time has been increased, particularly in view of the fact that there is a tremendous dearth in Canada of literature suitable for children and remembering that there are certain other influences coming in, such as the comic strips and the 25-cent books, and other influences from across the line which I do not think are very good. I am very pleased to see that the C.B.C. has seen fit to increase the time for children's programs. That is merely a comment in passing.—A. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, quite a lot of effort in sound broadcasting during the past year has gone into improving the children's broadcasts. The departments dealing particularly with them have been strengthened, and a little more money has been provided, and I think that the result has been very good. I think that the people who can listen around 5.30 and 6.00 o'clock on the English side will find a very nice type of program there. I am looking at a list of some of the things introduced during the past year, and some of them are popular with adults as well as with children. They include "Northward for Adventure", "Alice in Wonderland", and "The Water Babies", which were done by transcription from the B.B.C.

Q. We have been far behind the B.B.C. up to the present. I do not know whether we are catching up, with regard to that particular matter. They run a series of Sunday afternoons broadcasts, I believe, on shortwave. They are little plays like "Alice in Wonderland", and they are done beautifully, without sponsorship, of course.—A. Through the years their children's programs have been excellent, and that is why we are taking the transcriptions from them. "Alice in Wonderland" is one.

Mr. KNIGHT: I am glad.

The CHAIRMAN: "Religious Programs".

Mr. KNIGHT: The question I wanted to raise in this connection was concerned with the propriety of allowing commercial firms to enter the field of religious broadcasting. Firstly, I think that surely that is one field which might be free from commercial advertising. I should like to make it clear at the outset that I have no religious prejudices, and when I say that I mean it. I am not going to ask Mr. Dunton for the names of any denomination or any churches or anything of that sort. It is completely on a matter of principle that I want to ask my question. First of all, I should like to know whether any station or stations have asked permission of the B.B.C. to broadcast a religious program or religious programs with the advertising of a sponsor included.

The CHAIRMAN: You said "B.B.C."

By Mr. Knight:

Q. The C.B.C. I do not suggest that you can assume that larger responsibility, at least not yet.—A. There is no need for any private station to ask our permission to sponsor a religious program on the air. There is no regulation against it.

Q. Can the C.B.C. do anything in that way itself?—A. No, we have had a policy for some years in consultation with our National Advisory Council on Religious Broadcasting, against the commercial sponsorship of religious programs.

Q. Are there any stations, C.B.C. or otherwise, where religious broadcasting is given and where the name of the sponsor, not necessarily advertising any particular product, beer or soap or whatever it is, but where the name of the sponsor is given?—A. Not on the C.B.C. networks. There probably are on some private stations.

Q. In other words, that is a matter completely for the private stations, and is not in any way under the jurisdiction of the C.B.C.?—A. That is right.

Q. Has the C.B.C. ever been approached by organizations of any sort as to the correctness or propriety of doing this particular sort of thing?—A. Yes, we have had several approaches. I am not being specific, but there has been a great deal of misunderstanding, and some misleading information has come from several quarters in the country about our policy in that matter. The policy has been that for some time, and it is still being maintained.

Q. I do not know the name of the organization, but there is a national something or other conference of churches?—A. National?

Q. Which expresses opinions on that particular matter.—A. You mean the National Religious Advisory Council, which is the body we deal with, and which is actually set up at our request. It is called the National Religious Advisory Council on broadcasting.

Q. Can you tell us what their opinion was as expressed in their representations?—A. Through the years their opinion has been against commercial sponsorship of religious programs.

Q. I am certainly against it too. I can see not only a danger there but impropriety as well because surely the sponsor of any broadcast must have some regulation or control over the material which is broadcast under his sponsorship; and I think it would be an unfortunate matter if any commercial firm or institution was allowed in any way to influence the content of any religious program.

I have nothing whatever to say against religious programs, not at all; but I do think it would be a dangerous practice to allow sponsorship in any way. I think that such programs should be strictly sustaining programs—if that is the expression—on the part of the station concerned.

Mr. FLEMING: Would Mr. Knight say whether or not he draws a distinction between the broadcasting of a religious service on the one hand, and a program of a religious nature on the other hand, which is not actually a broadcast of a service?

Mr. KNIGHT: I was thinking more of the latter, Mr. Fleming, since I am in the witness box. I was thinking of religious services being broadcast under the sponsorship or the auspices of someone other than the religious body or the local religious organization concerned.

Mr. FLEMING: That is the former, not the latter.

Mr. KNIGHT: I am not sure which you asked first. I am thinking about religious services or religious ceremonies, if you like, conducted by some authority in the various churches. I am not concerned with what church it would be; I think any church.

Mr. GOODE: I must disagree with Mr. Knight because you have to take into consideration the wideness of the location of our population in Canada. Mr. Knight is saying—quite sincerely I am sure—that large centers which have large radio stations which can afford to have sustaining programs of this type should broadcast such programs; yet a small station located perhaps in a small town on the prairie could not afford to carry some of these things. But I believe those people are equally entitled to listen to some of these commentators. I have one such program in mind which I might mention. It is Bishop Sheen. I enjoy it although I do not belong to his church. I understand that in some places it is broadcast with a sponsor.

I would regret very much if a small town could not hear that program if they wished, on film, or sound track, or whichever way it goes. I do not think that these programs should just be available at large cities, while people in the small towns cannot have them.

Mr. KNIGHT: I do not know the program in question. It may be a very fine one; no doubt it is; but I am totally opposed to the idea of commercialism in any way, shape or form being mixed up with religious broadcasts or with the ability to give that opportunity to the listener of religious broadcasts, and that it should depend on advertising by some commercial company of its product, whatever it may be. We have already on Sunday invaded the field perhaps much further than we should have with commercial advertising in other fields than that of religion. I would like to see that one field, the religious field, closed completely to commercial advertising. Now, Mr. Dunton, you stated that as far as you are concerned you think that the policy of the C.B.C. has been opposed to that particular thing?

The WITNESS: Yes.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. Has there been any recent change of decision, or any recent slackening of the regulations in any way in that respect?—A. No.

Q. Which I was not aware of this program which Mr. Goode mentioned. What private stations would be concerned with it?—A. You mean the Bishop Sheen program; that is carried as part of the national television service on a sustaining, free basis, and it goes to the television stations right across the country.

Q. You say it is a television program?—A. Yes.

Q. Is it carried by private stations?—A. Yes, it is carried by the C.B.C. as part of the television network.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Private stations also carry it.

Mr. REINKE: It does not depend on advertising?

The WITNESS: No, it is free.

Mr. KNIGHT: Is the name of the sponsor given on the program?

The WITNESS: It is not.

Mr. REINKE: I wrote in about this particular program last fall because a number of people in Hamilton wanted to hear it and to see it on television. I hope that I am not out of order in speaking of television at this point. It was pointed out to me that one of the reasons the program was not allowed to come into Canada at that time, was that they could not get the cooperation of the sponsor of the program in the United States to allow it to come here without our making use of his name, or the name of the person who was sponsoring the program. But finally the C.B.C. did achieve it, and we now have it in Canada. It is a very fine program.

Mr. KNIGHT: There is no sponsorship or commercial firm connected with that program?

Mr. REINKE: That is quite correct with respect to the program in Canada.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. I mentioned the Bishop Sheen program because I think it is important that people should hear that type of commentator even if it means sponsorship by a commercial firm. I mentioned it because, if my memory serves me rightly, that program is sponsored in the United States.—A. Yes, certainly.

Q. I would rather have some of the programs from the denominations heard in Canada under sponsorship than not to have our people hear them at all. That was the issue which I was taking, in a very friendly way, with Mr. Knight.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Mr. Knight established his question by saying that you were contributing the time which was given to all religious broadcasts. But do you not think that if the C.B.C. followed your way of

thinking on this matter you would be curtailing many religious broadcasts by not having a sponsor for them?

Mr. KNIGHT: We have been told that they are not sponsored.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): There are some which are sponsored.

Mr. BOISVERT: Mr. Chairman, I thought that Mr. Dunton was the witness here today, not Mr. Knight.

The CHAIRMAN: We allow a few questions between members. We try to give a certain latitude.

Mr. FLEMING: For clarification.

Mr. BOISVERT: I can see no end to this committee if we go too far.

The CHAIRMAN: In previous committees, the chairman allowed a number of questions between the members.

By Mr. Gauthier (Nickel Belt):

Q. Do you not think that if Mr. Knight's reasoning were to be followed by the C.B.C. you would be curtailing, especially on private stations, the sponsorship of religious programs?—A. Naturally, while there is a regulation against it, they would be curtailed.

Q. You cannot have your cake and eat it too.

Mr. REINKE: I think we are out of order again. Were we not referring to "Station Relations"?

The CHAIRMAN: No. We are still on "Religious Programs".

Mr. REINKE: Mr. Dunton said that so far as C.B.C. policy is concerned they did not allow sponsorship. But we are not referring to the C.B.C. We are referring to private stations.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): It is the same principle whether it is on the C.B.C. or on private stations; the principle remains the same.

The CHAIRMAN: You were discussing the principle.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Yes.

The CHAIRMAN: Now that that has been cleared up, let us go on to "Sports".

By Mr. Goode:

Q. The coverage of the British Empire Games which were held in that great city of British Columbia, Vancouver, by your corporation was a very fine job, Mr. Dunton. There have been criticisms here and there, but you will always find that. I think the corporation did a wonderful job and I want to thank them for it on behalf of all British Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN: At that time I was travelling in Africa, along with Mr. Fleming and Mr. Knight. We used to try to get the news on the Empire service.

The WITNESS: That was the big sports coverage of the year. I wonder if you realize how enormous it was? It was carried in I do not know how many countries. Hours of broadcasting were provided by our people and were sent over the international service. I think it was a remarkably successful broadcasting effort.

Q. And it advertised British Columbia at the same time.—A. I think it was very good.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): I think your carrying of the Saturday night hockey broadcasts across the nation is very good programing. It has been very well received all across the country. I think the C.B.C. should be commended for it and asked to continue those broadcasts, because many people listen to them.

The WITNESS: We will be glad to. But I think it is only proper that we should pay tribute to the sponsor.

Mr. FLEMING: They are privately sponsored.

By Mr. Weaver:

Q. How far does the C.B.C. go in broadcasting the National Hockey League play-off games? Do you do any of them, or are they entirely done by sponsorship?—A. It depends on both the sponsor and the C.B.C. The general rule which we try to follow is that the semi-finals and the deciding games are carried.

Q. Do they go out on both your networks?—A. Just on the Trans-Canada.

Q. Would it be possible in cases of outstanding events like that, for them to go to both your networks? I have a number of complaints about inability to get the play-off games on Saturday nights.—A. There would be the matter of duplication right across the country, with the sponsor, having to pay for two networks in place of one. I do not think there are many places in Canada which cannot get them. They have pretty wide coverage.

By the Chairman:

Q. Is there any agreement between the C.B.C. and radio station CKAC in Montreal to broadcast the Thursday night games during the season?—A. It would not be a question of agreement. It is up to them, if they want to do it.

Q. The CBC station does it on Saturday, and station CKAC in Montreal, on Wednesday.

By Mr. Weaver:

Q. Has there been any change in the coverage during the last three years?—A. In the last few years there have been stations which have been added to our networks and which have increased their power. Is there any particular area you are thinking of?

Q. I was thinking of northern Manitoba.

Mr. GAUTHIER (*Nickel Belt*): Are there any booster stations there?

The WITNESS: CBW has gone up to 50 kilowatts; that is among those listed here; and CBK in Watrous; but we will be discussing that later under "Coverage in the North".

By Mr. Decore:

Q. What about the Grey Cup final game? Is that sponsored by somebody?—A. Yes.

Q. In other words, the sports commentator is not a CBC man?—A. On sound broadcasting? I do not remember who he was. We would be producing the broadcast, yes.

Mr. BUSHNELL: He is the choice of the sponsor.

By Mr. Decore:

Q. You say it is the choice of the sponsor. When we listened to the game out west between the Allouettes and the Eskimos last fall, we were not quite clear what was happening towards the end of the game.

Mr. GOODE: Maybe it was Montreal!

Mr. DECORE: We thought perhaps that the commentator had a big bet on, and could not find any words.

The WITNESS: I am afraid that I was watching it on television and not listening to the commentator.

Mr. FLEMING: Speaking as one who saw that game in its last exciting moments, I think it was wonderful that anybody could be coherent in all the excitement. It was terrific!

The CHAIRMAN: Wasn't that a lucky punch? We would call that a lucky punch in boxing.

Mr. GOODE: There was nothing of luck about it. It was western calculation.

The CHAIRMAN: That is what I expected from you, Mr. Goode.

By Mr. Dinsdale:

Q. I would like to ask if the CBC is equipped to handle on-the-spot sporting events which suddenly emerge as spectacular occasions? The reason I ask the question is that I am going to direct it later on to the Marilyn Bell swim last summer, when there was some criticism offered that the CBC was slow.—A. Yes; but most of the criticism was with respect to the television side.

The CHAIRMAN: Would you mind holding your question until we come to television.

Mr. DINSDALE: Very well. I shall save it until then.

By Mr. Weaver:

Q. I believe the situation is that the one station which does have a reasonable coverage in the north is a private station. I think it gets its programs from the dominion network. Apparently that program was not carried by the dominion network, consequently they could not get these play-off games.—A. What station would that be?

Q. CFAR.—A. In Flin Flon?

Q. Yes.—A. Flin Flon? I suspect they would be getting it.

Q. They get it Saturday nights, but this was some two years ago, and they were not able to get it.

A. It was in connection with the network. They were picking it up off the air and there might have been bad transmission that night. Normally they would have got it. It is on the Trans Canada Network.

The CHAIRMAN: Are there any other questions on this item? No.

"Special Programs". Are there any questions? No.

"Special Events"? No questions.

"Use of Talent"? No questions.

"International Radio Regulations".

By Mr. Weaver:

Q. Mr. Fleming opened the subject in connection with the Russian programs which were beamed into northern Canada. I wonder if Mr. Dunton would make any comment on that and tell us if they have considered the problem and how it might be matched by Canadian Interpretation?—A. I imagine that what I shall have to say will apply to the next item as well.

The CHAIRMAN: Let us take the two articles together at the same time: "International Radio Relations" and "Technical Development".

The WITNESS: We have had no exchange of programs with Russia, and we are not getting reports on any broadcasting they may do. The whole question of coverage in northern Canada has been a matter of a great deal of concern with us for some years and with the big developments up there particularly.

Last winter our management began a close study of the problem, working with the Department of Northern Affairs. To sum it up, in general, I think it is the usual question of money that is involved.

There would be two ways in which to have coverage. One would be to establish in the north itself a band of stations as in the rest of Canada. Presumably they would be 50 kilowatt stations. That would be the normal thing. A 50 kilowatt station covers approximately 1,000 square miles. It would require quite a few of them to cover the north country. That problem is being studied to see what would be involved.

I think a very big share of capital cost involved in operating such a station would be represented in the power. The other way is the possibility of establishing one—and probably two—shortwave stations which we think would be needed in order to have really good shortwave service in the northern areas. So again the corporation has not the funds in sight at present to do that sort of thing. It can be done in one way or another. Whether it can be done, and the extent to which it can be done will depend on the money and technical facilities.

By Mr. Weaver:

Q. Would you care to go into such things as booster stations? What I had in mind—and I do not know how far technical developments might have reached—was something like automatic stations which would pick up and re-broadcast?—A. You have to get a sure transmission to that station, and one of the ideas behind establishing high power shortwave stations would be to serve smaller stations in the north which might be established so that they could pick up those transmissions and relay them on standard bands for their areas. That would be one of the purposes of the shortwave. In a way they would be repeaters for the shortwave stations.

Q. You mentioned that with the increase in television there is a decrease in listening to radio broadcasting. This would not apply in the north, because it will be years before you can get television up there. Would it be fair to assume that at this particular time you are giving the north special attention in order, shall we say, to compensate for the fact that they will not be able to receive television broadcasts?—A. Yes. We do not think in quite that way. We see the continuing need for sound broadcasting services in Canada, for as far as we can foresee ahead. Of course, one of the main reasons for that is that large areas will not have television; and one of those regions is in the north. Because of increasing population in these outlying areas we think that service should be provided if possible.

By Mr. Goode:

Q. What is the real effect in the north? We had some discussion in the House—someone made a speech on it a little while ago—about the effect of these Russian broadcasts on the Eskimo and Indian in the north. You have investigated this matter. What is the actual effect? Is it doing any harm to our Canadian citizens up there, or is it a matter of counterbalance of harm that might be done over the years?—A. We have not investigated the effect on the population in the north. It has been simply beyond our capabilities. I know that the Department of Northern Affairs is very much interested in this matter and think it is important. We share their view on the importance of it, and would like very much to move into development up there in the north, if it can be done.

Q. Does every family in the north own a radio and tune in to the Russian stations? Do you know the situation?—A. I do not know it very well. People who are expert on the north may have more information as to how much shortwave listening the people do up there, how many have shortwave sets and how many people in communities where there are no stations would be satisfied with shortwave services.

Mr. FLEMING: You have no listening surveys among the Eskimos.

By Mr. Carter:

Q. I have a problem like Mr. Weaver's, but not in the north; it is in the south. I raised it two years ago in the committee. It is about the lack of service to the western half of my riding. I think that Mr. Ouimet said at the time that they were making extensive repairs to the station at St. John's and were hoping that would extend the coverage, and that if that did not happen supplementary stations would be built. That was two years ago and the station in St. John's is still in the same state and it does not reach out anyway. I should like to know what the situation is at the moment and what plans are under consideration.—A. Perhaps I could say that it is not only in the Northwest Territories where the coverage is still deficient. There are quite a few areas in Canada, some in the Maritimes, some in Northern Quebec, some in Northern Ontario, some in Northern Saskatchewan and in the interior of British Columbia, which still do not have coverage and which want it. We still have a relatively big coverage problem in many parts of the country. We have been studying these problems in different parts of the country for the last year or two, and it comes down to the question of the means to do it. The area which you mentioned around Port aux Basques, that area around the south coast, has been carefully studied with the object of finding an economic solution. So far our management has not found any way to solve that problem of serving a population along a very narrow strip along the coast, except at a very high cost. The situation at the moment is that we have not the funds in sight to build a number of the facilities needed for these various coverages.

Q. What would a station cost in Port aux Basques?—A. You can do a small one for—

Mr. OUMET (*General Manager, C.B.C.*): It all depends. If you mean a small one to cover the village of Port aux Basques—

Mr. CARTER: No. I mean one that would cover, say, a 100-mile radius.

Mr. OUMET: That is a matter of over \$100,000, maybe \$200,000. That is the kind of thing which is very costly.

Mr. CARTER: Two years ago you told me that you were practically rebuilding the old station at St. John's which was antiquated and falling down. What has been done in the two years?

Mr. OUMET: The new station in St. John's will be on the air any day now. It may be on the air now. The last time I checked it was a matter of a few weeks.

Mr. CARTER: If that station does not reach out far enough there are no further plans to extend it?

Mr. OUMET: That is correct.

Mr. CARTER: You have fishermen's programs, and there is no way of getting them out to the fishermen. A station in Newfoundland is located at St. John's. If there is a central station in St. John's, maybe it is in the wrong place, but a central station certainly should reach out. It is one of the few means we have of counteracting the isolation in those areas. That should be the main objective of the C.B.C.

Mr. OUMET: There is no technical way of fixing this station in St. John's so that it will serve the whole island. That is impossible. It is too far away, and the conductivity of the ground is not good enough. It would require another station in the west.

Mr. CARTER: What have you done about the fact that very often the station at St. John's is blanketed out and jammed by stations from South America and stations from Prince Edward Island?

Mr. OUMET: That is true of all stations when people listen to them at the limit of their coverage. All stations get blanketed if you go far enough away from the station, but the station is not blanketed in its primary service area. I realize that it is a big problem, but it is not really a technical problem; it is a problem of economics. You can do anything technically if you spend millions to make it feasible technically.

Mr. CARTER: How much did the station in Corner Brook cost?

Mr. OUMET: The station at Corner Brook cost around \$200,000.

The WITNESS: That is the estimate of a new one.

Mr. CARTER: The first one?

Mr. OUMET: The one that is there at the moment.

Mr. CARTER: The supplementary station?

Mr. OUMET: It was a much smaller station. It was about \$50,000.

Mr. CARTER: If you had a \$50,000 station in Port aux Basques, do you not think it would be an improvement?

Mr. OUMET: It would cover very few people. That is the problem. You could serve the village and the immediate surroundings, but if you try to get twenty or thirty miles away, it takes a big station, and you have to program it from the network. It is a very difficult country to serve, because the population is so scattered. In other areas similar to this we have used low power relay transmitters when there were networks available in the area, but there is no network available in that area. It just comes into Port aux Basques and goes into Corner Brook, Grand Falls, Gander and St. John's.

Mr. CARTER: Yes, but that is not the point. You are saying that it is impossible to service. Yet they can get reception from stations at Sydney and Antigonish.

Mr. OUMET: We could, for example, install a high power station. The stations you speak of are medium power stations at least. Then we would get into the area of cost of about \$150,000 to \$200,000.

Mr. CARTER: I do not think that that is an exorbitant sum to break the isolation which people have to undergo there. It is a matter of life and death for many of these people. They do not know market prices or the weather or anything of that kind. Everything comes from the St. John's station, and we do not get that.

Mr. OUMET: I am very sympathetic to your problem, and the corporation is. At the moment all these areas that are not yet served—there are a number of them not yet getting adequate coverage and in certain places you can say that there is no coverage at all from Canadian sources—are all places where it is beyond our means at the moment in terms of the money which we have. We would have to cut down something somewhere else to serve them.

Mr. CARTER: You are getting much more money now. Since we changed the system of financing the C.B.C., you are getting much more money than ever before. I ask for \$200,000 worth of sympathy.

Mr. DECORE: It is almost twenty to one.

Mr. KNIGHT: I have one question, Mr. Decore.

The CHAIRMAN: We may stand those two items for the next sitting.

By Mr. Knight:

Q. This will take just one minute. Mr. Dunton, I take it there has been some improvement, in some of these places, at least, across Canada where the reception is poor. Last year I asked a question on behalf of my colleague, Mr. Herridge, in regard to that district of East Kootenay and across from the

Arrow Lakes. What is the situation there? Has there been any improvement?—A. Several repeaters have gone into that area.

Q. Have any more of those low power transmitters been put in?—A. Yes. There are several communities which still need service, where there is no network connection at the moment. They will have to be built at a considerable cost, which we will have to capitalize. All these problems are purely questions of funds.

Q. What would be the remedy in that particular district? Would it mean more transmitters?—A. The only practical way in the district would be more of these low power transmitters.

Mr. BOISVERT: I have just one question. Mr. Dunton, do you not think that the R.C.M.P. would be the appropriate party to inform this committee with regard to the Soviet broadcasts to the north of Canada?

The WITNESS: I think that the R.C.M.P. should know, and probably the Department of Northern Affairs also.

Mr. KIRK (*Shelbourne-Yarmouth-Clare*): It is understood that "Technical Development" stands until next time.

Mr. FLEMING: May I ask if Mr. Dunton would be prepared at the next meeting to say something about research work and the expenditures on research in sound broadcasting which the C.B.C. is carrying on?

By Mr. Goode:

Q. May I ask whether Mr. Dunton at the next meeting would give us the cost of the program which I mentioned in regard to one individual station. I think that it would only mean a telephone call to a station in Ottawa. I should like to have some sort of an average cost. Will you do what you can?—A. We have no power to get it.

Q. If he refuses, you can tell the committee that it has been refused.—A. I shall be glad to ask.

Mr. REINKE: Under "Technical Development", I should like to have some information about FM broadcasting.

The CHAIRMAN: We will adjourn, gentlemen, until Thursday next at 11.00 o'clock a.m.

